





Pacific Studies

Vol.1, No.2 Spring 1978

PACIFIC STUDIES

a journal devoted to the study of the Pacific—
its islands and adjacent countries.

SPRING 1978

A Special Bicentennial Issue

honoring



CAPTAIN JAMES COOK

(1728-1779)

Published by
THE BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
HAWAII CAMPUS

Laie, Hawaii
96762

Editor: Robert D. Craig

Associate Editor: C. Jay Fox

Pacific Studies is published twice yearly by the Brigham Young University, Hawaii Campus, Laie, Hawaii, 96762, but responsibility for opinions expressed in the articles rests with the writers alone.

Subscription rate is US \$5.00. Accounts payable to the Brigham Young University, Hawaii Campus, should be sent to the editor at the above address.

Contributor's notes: Articles submitted to the editor should be the original typewritten copy, double spaced, following the *MLA Style Sheet*.

Books for review should also be sent to the editor.

© 1978 Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus. All Rights Reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

Published in cooperation with the Institute for Polynesian Studies, Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus, and the Polynesian Cultural Center.

*CONTENTS**Articles*

Introduction: James Cook: Man, Myth and Reality MICHAEL E. HOARE	71
Captain Cook's Influence on Hydrographic Surveying G. S. RITCHIE	78
Captain Cook and Omai E. H. McCORMICK	97
The Significance of Cook's Third Pacific Voyage to Russian Tenure in the North Pacific JAMES R. GIBSON	119
The Botanical Results of Captain Cook's Three Voyages and Their Later Influence WILLIAM T. STEARN	147
Publication of Cook's Journals: Some New Sources and Assessments HELEN WALLIS	163
Cook Studies: Whither Now? MICHAEL E. HOARE	195

PACIFIC STUDIES

Vol. 1, No. 2

Spring 1978

INTRODUCTION: CAPTAIN JAMES COOK: MAN, MYTH, AND REALITY*

by Michael Hoare

For perseverance, persistence, doggedness, determination and achievement, the eighteenth century possibly knew and honored no man as highly or as universally as the second son of a simple Scottish farm day laborer, James, and his Yorkshire wife, Grace. The man, their son, was James Cook, born on 27 October 1728 in a two-roomed thatched cottage in Marton Village, now in Middlesborough, County of Cleveland (formerly part of Yorkshire), England.

Over forty-five years later, on 30 January 1774, Cook stood on the quarterdeck of his sloop *HMS Resolution*—a soundly built former collier transformed for discovering—peering anxiously like all his men into the thick fog, surrounded by numerous icebergs, and finally confronted by impenetrable pack-ice in his questing to the southward in search of an elusive southern continent. They were in latitude 71°10' south (longitude 106°54' west), man's "farthest south" of the century, and their very attaining of it owed most to Cook's character: "...I whose ambition leads me not only farther than any other man has been before me, but as far as I think it possible for man to go." Balked by ice, they stretched back to the north. At the same moment, it is told, George Vancouver, a learning midshipman on this second round-the-world voyage of Cook, went out to the extremity of the bowsprit, waved his hat, and exclaimed, "*Ne Plus Ultra!*"

And Cook indeed strove to leave "nothing beyond" nor to quit any coast with anything unverified. He left nothing to chance and aimed

*This article was originally compiled as a postconference series of introductory comments and observations on the state of research on Cook's biography post-Beaglehole and particularly following the international symposium "Captain James Cook and His Times," held at Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, in late April 1978. The author had been for four months visiting professor and Canadian Commonwealth Fellow in the Department of History in the semester prior to the conference. The author also gave the academic summary and opening paper at the conference, and his more thoroughly documented article on the state of Cook research after the Vancouver gathering is published below.

for perfection in his two main fields of endeavor: geography and navigation. Between 1768 and 1779, Cook and his officers and scientists laid bare many hitherto unknown coasts and islands of the vast Pacific Ocean, sailing as far as 70° north and 71° south and along the coasts of Australia (New Holland) and New Zealand in the southwest and British Columbia, Alaska, and Kamchatka in the northeast. In between they discovered, re-examined, and accurately located major islands and archipelagos like New Caledonia, the New Hebrides and Aleutians, and the Friendly, Society, Hawaiian and Marquesas islands. These voyages, rich for the sciences of botany, zoology, astronomy, and oceanography, fascinating in their extent of anthropological discovery and the arts, artifacts, and ways of life of Pacific peoples, had an immense impact upon the future course of European art, drama, poetry, philosophy, and natural history. For the Pacific peoples touched by Cook's visits—Australian aborigines, New Zealand Maoris, Polynesians, Melanesians, Northwest Coast Indians, Aleuts, and others—the voyages foretold drastic and sometimes not-too-distant upheavals in their economies and ways of life.

Charles Darwin, who followed Cook to the Pacific seventy years later, reckoned that the Yorkshireman opened up another hemisphere. Another contemporary who sailed as an artist and scientist with Cook surmised that what the Captain "has added to the mass of our knowledge . . . will strike deep roots and long have the most decisive influence on the activities of men." And so it has proven, because the men who followed most immediately in Cook's wake were, in the main, those who had sailed with and were trained by him, mariners like William Bligh of the *Bounty*, George Vancouver of the new sloop *Discovery*, and the American-born Nathaniel Portlock and his associate in the early fur trade of the Northwest Coast, George Dixon. At a time when his monarch, George III, was losing the American colonies (soon to be the first United States) Captain Cook in the Pacific gained for Britain the raw material of a "second empire." That is why today the Union Jack flies still in the flags of British Columbia, Hawaii, Australia, and New Zealand.

It became an age of empire builders and heroes: of legendary figures such as Wolfe and Nelson who died like classical warriors of old and were enshrined in their national mythologies. Cook, slain by Hawaiians at Kealakekua Bay on 14 February 1779, became such a hero. But he was, too, something more. He was the poor man of humble origins and means who captivated the whole civilized world with his deeds.

Cook was imposing as a person. He stood out among Europeans and indigenous peoples as a leader. He was born to command and bore command well. He was thorough, meticulous, scrupulous, and honest, especially in all matters concerning the health of his seamen and in his relations with natives. He knew, in short, that he relied for success in discovery on both his hands and his hosts; therefore he treated both with a justice, tolerance, and humanity uncommon in his age. On his first two circumnavigations (1768–1771 and 1772–1775), noted one of his companions, “Cook punished rarely and reluctantly, never without valid reason and always with moderation.” He was the acme of correctness and fairness when trading with islanders and, unlike many of his forerunners, approached them with few or no prejudices and pride in his technical and military superiority.

For years, however, it was claimed that Cook cured scurvy, the age-old dread of mariners. Certainly Cook’s rigorous regime of hygiene, cleanliness, and searching for fresh salads and vegetables at landfalls spread not too far apart kept his crew healthy and the scurvy abated. But Cook in fact failed to lend his authority to the real and most efficacious means of arresting scurvy: fresh citrus fruits and juices. Thus the British Navy suffered on miserably from this disease for three or four decades more. It is a myth, too, that Cook himself spread the social diseases of syphilis and gonorrhea: the guilt of contagion lay with the more amorous of his officers, civilians, and crew. Cook, indeed, strove almost frantically and obsessively at times—but, of course, vainly—to hinder and stop liaisons between his men and native women.

How did such a man rise from obscurity to fame? The answer must lie partly in his intense ambition and in his determination to master the sciences and knowledge necessary to his chosen profession of master mariner and discoverer: astronomy, advanced mathematics, the intricacies of seamanship and surveying, and the arts of command—victualing and planning ruthlessly ahead. Cook developed an uncanny nose and sixth sense for a new coast, a fresh danger, or an impending mishap. It was said of him that he could be asleep in his cot but on deck in a trice if the ship veered off course or her motion changed perceptibly. He had what one friend called a “sailor’s eye,” able to discern faults and problems in seamanship which even experienced sea officers could miss, such as the set of sails and lines. He was by instinct and training a seafarer, “the seamen’s seaman,” one of the greatest of all time in vessels rigged with sails.

Cook, after some elementary learning and a short interlude as grocer’s and then haberdasher’s boy, began at eighteen his vital seaman’s

apprenticeship in the hard school of the East Coast and North Sea collier trade off England. Here they plied those difficult shoal waters between the home port Whitby and the metropolis London and often got as far as the European coast and the Baltic ports. Over eleven years Cook "learnt the ropes" and, particularly, about ships and their ways. So good did he become as a mate in the mercantile service that his employer offered him command of his own vessel, the *Freelove*. But in 1755, aged twenty-six, Cook threw up this honor, volunteered for the Royal Navy, and was entered as an able seaman in HMS *Eagle*, a sixty-gun ship of the line.

Cook now began his lifelong log-keeping, and within a month such were his superiors impressed and such, we now believe, was the patronage working for him quietly ashore that he was promoted master's mate. The obscure country boy was on the road upward in a navy where humble men rarely rose high. Next came war, action and cruising against the French. After two years, examinations passed, Cook became master in the twenty-four-gun frigate *Solebay*. The master was any naval vessel's professional navigator, the ship's eyes and ears, the captain's highly skilled manager of things nautical. Cook very soon left his frigate to be the master of *Pembroke*, a new sixty-four-gun ship of the line under Captain John Simcoe. Destiny now awaited Cook in Canada.

In eastern Canada, along the St. Lawrence, he learned the finer techniques of surveying by land and water. He was one of the Royal Navy masters who surveyed and buoyed the St. Lawrence channel below Quebec for the invasion fleet. Here he followed in the steps of a long French tradition of mastery of astronomical and nautical surveying at home and abroad. Quebec captured, Cook was appointed master in the seventy-gun *Northumberland* and entered on a life of routine surveys and chartmaking, honing and mastering his skills in this art. Briefly he surveyed in Newfoundland waters after the recapture of St. John's in 1762. The thirty-four-year-old master now returned to England with numerous drafts of charts and observations, a man of "Genius and Capacity . . . well qualified," thought his Captain Alexander, Lord Colville, "for the Work he has performed, and for greater Undertakings of the same kind."

Surveying Newfoundland and the other newly acquired provinces became vital to British trade and dominance in eastern Canada. Between 1763 and 1767, Cook led the Newfoundland survey and for most of the time commanded his own schooner, the *Grenville*, but still as a master. His charts of the southern and western sides of the island were

the finest anywhere in the world. Few contemporaries now surpassed him: the world, literally, could be his on the strength of his Canadian work.

And so it was. In April 1768 Cook, the master, became Mr. Cook, lieutenant, commanding HMS *Endeavour* commissioned to convey persons to the southward for discovery and to observe the transit of Venus at the newly discovered island of Tahiti. But his was no great ship of the line, not even a regular navy vessel. *Endeavour* was a "cat-built" vessel, or simply a "cat," a ship of "narrow stern, projecting quarters," and "a deep waist, and having no ornamental figure on the prow," a vessel built usually "remarkably strong." She had, too, a shallow draught and was, in short, of exactly the same type as an east-coast collier. Cook was at home. *Endeavour* was a workhorse, a vessel chosen for strength and capacity. In her between 1768 and 1771 Cook charted the difficult New Zealand waters and the east coast of Australia—almost losing his "cat" on the Great Barrier Reef in June 1770. He also found and surveyed the Society Islands, sailed through Torres Strait, and advanced man's ability to find longitude accurately by lunar observations and to survive on long voyages.

A second world voyage, this time planned more exclusively by Captain Cook himself, was inevitable and it took place between 1772 and 1775 in the sloops *Resolution* and *Adventure*. Cook this time chose his own ships; but with all the Navy's vessels available he still opted for colliers, for their capacity, strength, and shallow draught. The two vessels chosen, both built in Cook's apprenticeship port of Whitby, were the *Marquis of Granby* (462 tons with a beam of thirty-five feet and lowerdeck of 111 feet) and the *Marquis of Rockingham* (340 tons and corresponding measurements of ninety-seven and twenty-eight feet). The first became *Resolution* (almost 100 tons larger than *Endeavour*) and the second *Adventure*, commanded by Captain Tobias Furneaux. *Adventure* proved a less satisfactory ship with a less venturesome commander and, during the voyage, lost Cook off New Zealand and sailed home one year ahead of him bearing the islander Omai.

Cook's own second voyage was his most epic and in discovery his most innovative. He mastered mechanical chronometry; defined the bulk of southern Polynesia and recognized eastern Melanesia; added tropical, subtropical, and Antarctic islands to the map and closely circumnavigated ice-bound Antarctica, coming to within respectable distance of solid land. This voyage was also the most highly scientific.

Something, however, remained, not in the South Pacific but in the North: the age-old problem of a northern passage around Canada. On

his third and fatal voyage Cook set out to resolve this problem and the vexed geography of western Canada, Alaska, and the Bering Strait. On the way he discovered the Hawaiian group. For the second time Cook sailed in *Resolution*, although she now leaked more noticeably, but took a new consort, *Discovery*, the smallest of Cook's ships and another sound collier with all the desired known qualities.

As in the south so in the north was Cook thwarted by impassable ice. But he gave us the published outline and coast of Alaska and the possibility that became British Columbia. Here there was no detailed chart making, only reconnaissance: the objective was Alaska and the Bering Strait, not Vancouver Island, Nootka, or anywhere else in modern British Columbia.

Storm and necessity brought Cook to the province. He needed shelter, refreshment and repairs. He missed in the night the Strait of Juan de Fuca, found an indentation he called Hope Bay on Vancouver Island—which he thought part of the main—but was attracted into Nootka Sound and there found his anchorage, not an ideal one, at Ship Cove (now Resolution Cove) on the seaward end of Bligh Island. Here they were trading with and having concourse with the Indians in all manner of useful and disastrous ways from the end of March until near the end of April 1778. The timber saved Cook's vessel, the *Resolution*, but the wild weather prolonged his stay. After Nootka, Cook was mostly out of sight of land, sailing past the northern part of Vancouver Island and the Queen Charlotte Islands and so on to Alaskan waters.

Cook's exploration of the Northwest Coast challenged the Spanish and the Russians; it brought, too, British and American ships and entrepreneurs in quest of furs.

But, stricken on the second voyage with a vitamin B deficiency and intestinal infection, Cook, like many of his men and officers, was a sick, sometimes sullen and less iron man on the third voyage. He raged, he swore, he lost control more and more. His underlings took more liberties with people and property. Cook, in worse health than he would admit—perhaps he had the first symptoms of tuberculosis—withdrew more and more and became uncharacteristically wanton and took risks.

For these and other reasons more complex he died in Hawaii. Europe and England made a myth and martyr of him. But he was, in truth, an uncommon man risen with competence and help from a humble origin.

Royal Society of New Zealand, Wellington.
Third Cook Fellow.

DR. MICHAEL E. HOARE, FLS, was appointed Cook Fellow of New Zealand between 1975–1978 as the Manuscripts Librarian, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington. Dr. Hoare has held research appointments at Monash University and the Australian National University at Canberra, was Humboldt Foundation Research Fellow at Göttingen in 1970–1975, and was for nine years the Manuscripts Librarian of the Basser Library of the Australian Academy of Science. His research interests are in the history of science in Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific, and he has published works on J. F. and J. G. A. Forster, James Cook and Pacific exploration, the history of New Zealand science, as well as numerous periodical articles. Dr. Hoare was a visiting professor at Simon Fraser University early in 1978 as a Canadian Commonwealth Fellow.

CAPTAIN COOK'S INFLUENCE ON HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYING

by G. S. Ritchie

Before we can attempt to assess Captain Cook's contribution to hydrographic surveying, it is first necessary to try to establish the state of this art in the middle of the eighteenth century, when James Cook first went to sea in Captain John Walder's Whitby Colliers.

In the year 1693, two important atlases of sea charts were published in England and France respectively, the first major marine cartographic events for over a hundred years. Lucas Wagenaer, the one-time Netherlands sea pilot, had published his atlas of sea charts *Spiegel der Zeevaerdt* in 1585.¹ This provided for navigation from the Baltic to Cadiz. As *The Mariner's Mirrour*,² Wagenaer's atlas was published in England in 1588, the year of the Spanish Armada. Its success was such that British seamen confidently used their "waggoners," as they termed these atlases, for a century to follow.

When it became clear to Samuel Pepys, secretary of the Navy, that the Dutch knew more about British waters than English seamen knew themselves, he, with the backing of King Charles II, assigned to a former Navy master, Captain Greenville Collins, the work of surveying the British coasts and harbors. Even with the two yachts provided, Collins had an enormous task, for at that time there was no triangulation network or fixed stations in Britain on which to base his surveys. With a measuring chain, a compass and a leadline, and little else, it took Collins seven years to complete the work, which resulted in the publication of *Great Britain's Coasting Pilot*³ in 1693, containing forty-eight harbor and coastal charts.

Collins's charts were plane charts, similar in many ways to those of Wagenaer, with well-executed views illustrating leading or clearing lines to facilitate safe entry into harbors.

Great Britain's Coasting Pilot ran into a half-dozen editions before the middle of the eighteenth century, proving that it met the British

¹Lucas Janszoon Waghenar, *Spiegel der Zeevaerdt* (Leyden: Ghedruct C. Platijn, 1585).

²Translated by Anthony Ashley.

³Greenville Collins, *Great Britain's Coasting Pilot* (London: F. Collins, 1693). The Mount and Page edition of 1753 was published recently in reduced facsimile by George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., London.

coasting seaman's needs; nevertheless, the atlas was much criticized in official circles, and when it was compared with *Le Neptune François*,⁴ published in Paris in that same year (1693), France's contemporary lead in hydrography was clearly apparent.

In the latter part of the seventeenth century, France, under King Louis XIV and his sea-minded Secretary of State Colbert, had been enjoying a scientific awakening. Among other advances were the establishment of the *Academie Royal des Sciences* and the *Observatoire de Paris*. An Italian cosmographer, Jean Dominique Cassini, was appointed Director of the *Observatoire*, where he developed a method of finding longitude on land by the observation of Jupiter's satellites. This enabled a number of geographical positions to be fixed along the coasts of France, and the coastline was redrawn which, by the apparent reduction of his territory, displeased the king, who is said to have observed that his surveyors had lost him more land than his armies had gained!

It is not surprising that the charts in *Le Neptune François*, based on these geographical positions and employing, on the smaller scales, Mercator's projection—so well suited to the navigator—were superior to their British counterpart. Their excellence led to the establishment of *Le Dépôt des Cartes et Plans de la Marine* in 1720, the first ever national hydrographic office, where many beautiful charts were compiled during the eighteenth century under the direction of Jacques Nicolas Bellin, who carried out, among other surveys, those in French North American territories prior to the Seven Years' War (1756–1763).

Both the British and French atlases made use of a number of the charting symbols used by Wagenaer, some of which he in turn had copied from Portuguese portulan charts. Thus began the international adoption of such practices as the use of figures to show water depths, an anchor symbol to denote a safe anchorage and crosses to indicate the presence of dangerous submerged rocks. All these remain in use on charts of all nations to the present day.

Much of the superiority of the French charts resulted from surveys controlled by a triangulation framework extended from a measured baseline. Slowly knowledge of this form of control of marine survey, which required measuring chains or poles, a theodolite, a sextant, and a portable azimuth compass, together with a protractor for laying down the angles on the plotting sheet, flowed along scientific channels from the Continent to Britain. One such route appears to have been via Edinburgh University, where the Professor of Mathematics, Colin Mac-

⁴*Le Neptune François* (Paris: Ministère de la Marine, 1693).

laurin, an FRS (Fellow of the Royal Society) at the age of twenty-one, included in his teaching plane trigonometry, military surveying, and astronomy. He was a frequent visitor to France (he had won prizes in that country for scientific essays, including one on tides) and was friendly with Jacques Cassini, who had succeeded his father at the *Observatoire* and was presently engaged on a national triangulation.

In 1749, Professor Maclaurin was requested by a number of land-owners to draw up directions for a land and marine survey of the Orkney Island and to recommend a former pupil to undertake the work. He named Murdoch Mackenzie as having the mathematical qualifications necessary for making "a geometrical survey." We can detect the Continental influence when we read that Mackenzie measured a baseline on a frozen lake from which he extended a triangulation to beflagged stations which were subsequently used to fix the soundings by bearings taken from the boat with an azimuth compass.⁵

Orcades,⁶ the atlas of charts resulting from Murdoch Mackenzie's surveys, was published in 1751. It impressed the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty so much that they engaged him to make an exact survey of the northwest coast of Scotland and provided him with the small boat *Culloden* for the work, during which an extensive triangulation network was carried across the Minch.

During the five years when Cook sailed in Captain John Walker's Whitby Colliers from the northeast ports of London and the Baltic, it is doubtful whether he gave much thought to chartmaking, relying as he did for his navigation more on the lead and line, and traditional sailing directions passed on by masters to their mates; however, he must surely have become acquainted with *Great Britain's Coasting Pilot*.

After joining the Navy in 1755, Cook began studying for his warrant as master, which he received from the Trinity House examiners on 29 June 1757. At this stage he would have learnt some of the elements of simple hydrography, such as how to sound out a safe anchorage or channel, for such tasks fell to the ship's master.

It was possibly the greatest stroke of good fortune in Cook's life, and he was generally a lucky man, that his first appointment as master was to HMS *Pembroke* on the North American Station. His captain was John Simcoe, uniquely, in those days, an enthusiastic navigator (navigat-

⁵A. H. W. Robinson, *Marine Cartography in Britain* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1962), p. 61.

⁶Murdoch Mackenzie, *Orcades, or a Geographic and Hydrographic Survey of the Orkney and Lewis Islands in Eight Maps* (London: s.n., 1750).

ing was a professional task which most naval captains left to their masters). Simcoe perceived Cook's potential and, lending him Leadbetter's mathematical works and other books on navigation, encouraged him to study trigonometry and astronomy.

It is most likely that by 1757 an officer having Simcoe's keen interest in navigation would be aware of the atlas *Orcades* and the description given therein by Murdoch Mackenzie of his method of hydrographic surveying based on triangulation, which he had now been developing on the west coasts of Scotland for a further six years. Whether or not Simcoe was able to impart detailed knowledge of Mackenzie's methods to Cook, he surely implanted in him a keen interest in chartmaking which prepared the young master to drink from the European "fountain of knowledge" to which he was soon to have direct access.

In his biography, Professor Evans gives a brief description of the surveyor Samuel Holland: "Born near Nijmegen about 1728, he was an amiable man who, after mathematical training enlisted in the Dutch Army before transferring to the British. . . . He was an Officer in the Royal American Regiment and served in New York in military, engineering, and cartographic capacities."⁷

Cook's meeting with Holland in July 1758 is described in a letter Holland wrote many years later to Captain Simcoe's son, who was, in 1792, the newly appointed Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada. A portion of the letter is reproduced here:

The day after the surrender of Louisbourg, being at Kensington Cove surveying and making a plan of the place, with its attack and encampments, I observed Capt. Cook (then Master of Capt. Simcoe's ship, the *Pembroke* man of war) particularly attentive to my operations; and as he expressed an ardent desire to be instructed in the use of the Plane Table (the instrument I was then using) I appointed the next day in order to make him acquainted with the whole process; he accordingly attended, with a particular message from Capt. Simcoe expressive of a wish to have been present at our proceedings; and his inability, owing to indisposition of leaving his ship; at the same time requesting me to dine on board; and begging me to bring the Plane Table pieces along. I, with much pleasure, accepted that invitation, which gave rise to my acquaintance with a truly sci-

⁷G. N. D. Evans, *Uncommon Obdurate; by Several Public Careers of J. F. W. Des Barres* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969).

entific gentleman for which I ever hold myself indebted to Capt. Cook. I remained that night on board, in the morning landed to continue my survey at White Point, attended by Capt. Cook and two young gentlemen. . . . During our stay in Halifax, whenever I could get a moment of time from my duty, I was on board the *Pembroke* where the great cabin, dedicated to scientific purposes and mostly taken up with a drawing table, furnished no room for idlers. Under Capt. Simcoe's eye, Mr. Cook and myself compiled materials for a chart of the Gulf and River St. Lawrence, which plan at his decease was dedicated to Sir Charles Saunders; with no other alterations than what Mr. Cook and I made coming up the River. . . . Mr. Cook frequently expressed to me the obligation he was under to Captain Simcoe and on my meeting him in London in the year 1776, after his several discoveries, he confessed most candidly that the several improvements and instructions he had received on board the *Pembroke* had been the sole foundation of the services he had been able to perform. . . .⁸

Cook was clearly giving credit to both Simcoe and Holland as his teachers and acknowledging that the hard winter of 1758-1759 was a vital period in his apprenticeship as a sea surveyor.

Simcoe and Cook were clearly unaware of the plane table until they met Holland in 1758, although its use for land mapping had been demonstrated in the *Connaissance des Temps* (The French Almanac) in 1683.⁹ I believe that Cook developed the concept of the plane table method in making running surveys of a coastline, as I shall attempt to show later. Cook's surveying activities during the British attack on Quebec are well known. After the fall of the city he was transferred to the *Northumberland* under the Command of Lord Colville.

The *Northumberland* entered St. Johns, Newfoundland, on 20 September 1762 after a military force under Lieutenant Colonel Amherst had recaptured the place from the French. Here in Newfoundland a second meeting between Cook and a military surveyor took place when

⁸R. A. Skelton, "Captain James Cook as a Hydrographer," *The Mariner's Mirror*, 40, No. 2 (May 1954), letter reprinted on pp. 97 and 98. Holland's letter to J. G. Simcoe was first printed by H. Scadding, "A Notice of Samuel Holland," *Canadian Magazine*, October, 1895; reprinted by Willis Chapman, "The Life and Times of Major Samuel Holland," *Ontario Historical Society, Papers and Records*, 21 (1924), 11-90.

⁹*La Connaissance des Temps ou Caledrier et Ephemerides* (Paris, 1683), published annually.

Colville sent his master to accompany J. F. W. Des Barres, an engineer on Amherst's staff, to survey Conception Bay, where British fisheries were to be reestablished and extended.

Des Barres, of a noted Huguenot family, was educated at Basle Bay by the Bernouilli family, well known for their study and teaching of mathematics. About 1752, he went to England to enroll as a cadet in the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich and received a commission in 1756 in the Royal American Regiment.¹⁰ Whilst at Woolwich he would have been able to apply his knowledge of mathematics to surveying which, particularly in its application to the construction of fortifications, was taught at the academy.

Whilst Des Barres surveyed the fortifications of Carbonera Island, Cook made plans of Harbour Grace and the Bay of Carbonera. It seems probable that Des Barres learnt as much about hydrography from the practical seaman as Cook learnt about survey control from the military engineer. We have clear evidence that within three years of this meeting Des Barres had become a competent hydrographic surveyor working in North America under the general direction of the Lords of the Admiralty.¹¹

In 1762, the *Northumberland* returned to Spithead. The declaration to the cessation of hostilities with France was read to the ship's company and the ship paid off on 8 December. Lord Colville, who had been promoted to rear admiral in October, wrote to the secretary of the Admiralty on 30 December concerning his master for the last three years:

Mr. Cook late Master of the *Northumberland* acquaints me that he has laid before their Lordships all his Draughts and Observations, relating to the River St. Lawrence, Part of the Coast of Nova Scotia, and of Newfoundland.

On this Occasion, I beg leave to inform their Lordships that from my Experience of Mr. Cook's Genius and Capacity, I think him well qualified for the Work he has performed, and for greater Undertakings of the same kind—These Draughts being made under my own Eye I can venture to say, they may

¹⁰Evans, chapter I.

¹¹Evans reprints on pp. 13 and 14 a report made by Des Barres to his Superior, Lord Colville, in May of 1765, describing his method of hydrographic surveying. The original is to be found in *Admiralty Secretary in Letters*, Adm. 1/482, in the Public Record Office, London.

be the means of directing many in the right way, but cannot mislead any.¹²

From this moment the avid learner became a gifted teacher.

The Treaty of Paris concluding the Seven Years' War was signed in February 1763. France lost most of her North American colonies but was to reoccupy the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon off the south coast of Newfoundland.

In April 1763, at the request of Captain Graves, the governor, Cook was selected to survey the coasts and harbors of Newfoundland. He was able to engage a military draughtsman and obtained a theodolite and a brass quadrant fitted with a telescope made by John Bird. Here were the two instruments necessary for extending a triangulation from a baseline and observing for meridional latitudes, which indicates that Cook intended controlling his surveys on the Murdoch Mackenzie pattern.

On arrival in Newfoundland, Cook's first task was to survey the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, a sensible military precaution decided upon by Graves before handing them back to the French. Whilst Captain Douglas in HMS *Tweed* delayed the landing of the French governor designate, much to the latter's annoyance, Cook under great pressure from Douglas completed the work by the end of July. Surveys made in such circumstances are anathema to hydrographers, but the requirement for speed wonderfully concentrates the mind on introducing new methods and on streamlining. Cook would have benefited from such an experience as many surveyors have done since.

Graves had bought a small Massachusetts-built schooner for survey work on the Newfoundland coast. Renamed the *Grenville*, she carried Cook as a supernumerary to the northern tip of Newfoundland to commence the surveys in the late summer of 1763.

For the winter of 1763–1764 Cook and his military draughtsman returned to England in HMS *Tweed* to draw the fair charts of their surveys. By spring, Captain Palliser had taken over as governor of Newfoundland and, with Cook's advice, more satisfactory and permanent arrangements were made for the manning and operation of the *Grenville*. Cook was placed in command, whilst his master's mate was chosen for his navigational and mathematical knowledge and became vir-

¹²J. C. Beaglehole, *The Life of Captain James Cook* (London: A. & C. Black Ltd., 1974). A letter from Lord Colville to Mr. John Cleveland, Secretary to the Admiralty, dated 30 December 1762, is reprinted on p. 59 (Adm. 1/482).

tually the assistant surveyor. The military draughtsman passed from the scene. The ship, now with a permanent complement of seamen, could operate independently and sail to England each winter to refit at a naval dockyard in the Thames.

William Parker was the first master's mate. When he was promoted to lieutenant during the winter of 1766-1767, Michael Lane, a naval schoolmaster and former scholar of Christ's Hospital Mathematical School ("Blue Coat School"), succeeded him.

After working under Cook on the Newfoundland surveys during the summer of 1767, Lane assumed command of the *Grenville* when Cook was selected to command the *Endeavour* during the early spring of 1768. Lane, with his basic mathematical training, had acquired from Cook in one summer season sufficient knowledge to become a sea surveyor in his own right. He continued in command of the *Grenville*, surveying the coasts of Newfoundland and Labrador until the schooner was broken up seven years later. He was then appointed as mate of the schooner *Lion* which was employed surveying under the command of Lieutenant Pickersgill, who had learnt his chartmaking from Cook in the *Endeavour* and the *Resolution*. Lane eventually commanded the *Lion* for surveys in North American waters. Cook's influence was spreading.

During the five years when Cook was charting the Newfoundland coasts he used the good weather of the summer to work in the field with the ship and her boats; in the winter he was far away, drawing his charts on shore while his ship was refitted in the Thames. He established a naval pattern, largely followed to the present day, whereby an approximately eight-month good weather "surveying season" is followed by the "lie-up" period.

After his first season on the *Grenville*, Cook soon established the British naval practice whereby the man who is making the surveys is also in command. The surveyor thus assumes the responsibility for risks to his vessel, so that a practiced seaman may press forward the work of charting unsurveyed waters with a vigor which divided control can never permit.

Foolhardy risks Cook did not take. During the first lie-up he had the *Grenville* converted from schooner rig to a brig so that he had a square sail on the main topmast which could be rapidly laid aback to stay the vessel's progress when meeting unexpected dangers. He also arranged whenever possible to carry on board local fishermen who frequently have knowledge of uncharted submerged shoals and rocks.

The ability to be both a bold and a prudent seaman when exploring unknown seas was part of Cook's nature. This intangible gift has ever since been recognized as a priceless attribute in a sea surveyor.

Cook's interest in astronomy, aroused by Simcoe, alerted him to an opportunity which he seized avidly. He observed with Bird's brass telescope quadrant the beginning and end of an eclipse of the sun from the Burgeo Islands off the south coast of Newfoundland on 5 August 1766. This eclipse had also been observed at Oxford, and the results enabled an FRS named Bevis to calculate the longitude of the Burgeo Islands from London and to communicate these results to the Royal Society.¹³ This achievement brought Cook to the attention of the world of science and was certainly a significant factor in his favor when the Admiralty and the Royal Society were considering the appointment of a commander of the expedition to be sent to Tahiti to observe the transit of Venus.

When Cook sailed in the *Endeavour* in 1768 he had on board the *Nautical Almanac*,¹⁴ first published in 1766, giving tables of angular distances of the moon and a limited number of the brighter stars from the sun at Greenwich at three hourly intervals. These tables enabled the longitude of the ship's position to be found by observers using a quadrant to measure the actual lunar distances, together with some fairly extensive mathematical reduction.

It is doubtful whether Cook was proficient at reducing lunar sights when he sailed from Plymouth. What is quite clear is that he very soon attained proficiency in the art with the advice of the astronomer Green who sailed with him. He quickly thereafter taught his officers and midshipmen. Wales, the astronomer of the second voyage, wrote that "there were few, even of the Petty Officers, who could not observe the Distance of the Moon from the Sun, or a star, the most delicate of all observations, with sufficient accuracy."¹⁵ A lieutenant, the master and the master's mate would join the astronomer and the captain in making these lunar observations; the mean of their results provided the accepted longitude.

Although the new timepieces, including particularly Kendall's No. 1, enabled Cook on his second and third voyages to observe equal morn-

¹³J. Bevis, *Philosophical Transactions*, Royal Society, London, 57 (1767), 213-216, reprinted in full by Beaglehole. See footnote 12.

¹⁴*The Nautical Almanac and Astronomical Ephemeris* (London: Commissioners of Longitude, 1767), printed annually.

¹⁵G. M. Badger, ed., *Captain Cook Navigator and Scientist* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1970), ch. 4 by Sir Frederick White, "Cook the Navigator."

ing and afternoon altitudes of the sun to find longitude by time differences from Greenwich, regular observations of lunar distances were also continued. Numerous lunars were observed both afloat and ashore, the instruments being set up at such stations as Point Venus, Dusky Sound, and Nootka (where 137 lunars were taken). These places were thus fixed with increasing accuracy whilst the gaining or losing rates of the timepieces whilst sailing from one station to another could be found and appropriate corrections made to the longitudes observed on board.

Cook learnt much from Green and Wales the astronomers, and he and Lieutenant King were themselves appointed as the astronomers on the *Resolution* for the third voyage. Cook's superb mastery of the sextant, the chronometer, and the *Nautical Almanac*, and the sheer pleasure he took in the effective use of them, inspired his successors.

The French Senator Gregoire, speaking in the year after Cook's death, recognized Britain's supremacy in this field, a state of affairs which Cook had done so much to bring about. "*Les succes des Anglais, spécialement dans la quèrre de 1761—la guèrre de Sept Ans—n'ont que trop prouvé que la supèriorité de la marine decide souvent du sort de la guèrre. . . . Or, les Anglais, bien convaincus que sans astronomie, on n'avait ni commerce, ni marine ont fait des dépenses incroyables pour pousser cette science vers son point de perfection.*"¹⁶

Cook was keenly aware of the changes in technique he had to make as a surveyor to adopt his methods to the needs of an explorer. When making a running survey through the New Hebrides he wrote in his journal "The word survey, is not to be understood here, in its literal sense. Surveying a place, according to my Idea, is taking a Geometrical Plan of it, in which every place is to have its true situation, which cannot be done in a work of this kind."¹⁷

Cook developed the plane table concept to meet the requirements of his "running surveys." He and his officers observed for latitude and longitude at intervals as the ship sailed along offshore, the resulting positions forming the terminals of a number of traverses. Each change of course, necessitated either by the changing direction of the shoreline or a shift in the wind, was carefully recorded, as were the times when azimuth compass bearings were taken to fix features on or near the coast, or distant inland peaks. Intervening coastal detail was sketched in from

¹⁶Frédéric Marguet, *Histoire générale de la Navigation* (Paris: Société d'éditions géographiques, 1931), p. 80.

¹⁷J. C. Beaglehole, ed., *The Journals of Captain James Cook*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society, 1955-1967), II, 509 n. 4.

the deck, whilst the log was frequently streamed to keep a record of the ship's speed.

Darkness or foul weather would oblige Cook to leave the coast, only to return at dawn or when better weather prevailed, to take up the survey again where it had been left off. Cook's success lay in great attention to recording courses, speeds, and intersecting compass bearings, and above all in the importance Cook attached to completing the work while fresh in the mind; which often necessitated working far into the night. Such dedication to the tasks, so difficult to pursue by candle-light in a heaving vessel, was assimilated by his officers. There were a few opportunities for detailed surveys and these he gave to his officers to complete according to his geometrical plan, resulting in charts by Clerke, Pickersgill, Bligh, Roberts, Molyneux, Gilbert, and Riou.

Cook's methods were used and passed on by those of his officers who subsequently sailed on their own voyages, and in this respect Vancouver (A.B. on the *Resolution* on the second voyage and midshipman on the *Discovery* on the third voyage) and Bligh (master of *Resolution* on the third voyage) are the most prominent.

Roberts (A.B. on the *Resolution* on the second voyage and master's mate in the same ship on the third voyage) was an excellent draughtsman and was employed from 1781 to 1784 drawing the fair charts of the third voyage for the engraver. In 1789, he was appointed to a new *Discovery* for a survey in the northwest Pacific, with Vancouver as his first lieutenant. However, during the excitement aroused by the "Spanish Armament" the ship was put to other uses, and it was not until 1791 that the expedition finally sailed. Vancouver was then placed in command of the *Discovery*, with Lieutenant Broughton in the tender *Chatham*, a two-masted brig, to accompany him. Vancouver was able to select some excellent officers; Zachary Mudge was his first lieutenant, and under him were Peter Puget and Joseph Baker, with Joseph Whidbey as master. James Johnstone was Broughton's master on the *Chatham*. All of these learnt to lay down a coastline and sound the adjacent waters and are commemorated by named features on the west coasts of Canada and the United States.

Vancouver began his work on the west coast at 30° north and on reaching Cook's Cape Flattery he entered the Strait of Juan de Fuca in search of a passage to the Atlantic; and here, as Vancouver worked eastwards, we can see how he developed Cook's running survey into something more detailed.

Inside the strait a new and more detailed survey technique was developed as the expedition charted the southern shore.

Both vessels were anchored when suitable shelter offered and a tented observatory set up ashore for obtaining the gain of losing rates of the timepieces by daily comparison with the passage of the Sun across the meridian at noon, and for the fixing of geographical position, and determining of the local variation of the magnetic compass with reference to a true bearing of heavenly bodies. Meanwhile two or more boats, each with an officer in charge, were provisioned for three weeks or so and were despatched along the unexplored coastline ahead. Thus the boats took up the running survey of the intricate coast, proceeding steadily under oars that they might follow closely the trend of the coast, upon which, from time to time, the officers landed to take hand-compass bearings of the direction of the coastline, both forward and back, and of the sides, or tangents, of off lying islands so that a number of such bearings would determine their positions relative to the shore. The courses and distances covered by the boats were carefully assessed and recorded, so that on return to the ship after a week or two's absence, the work could be transferred to the fair drawing sheet which was kept up-to-date by Lieutenant Baker working steadily away on board. The vessels weighed anchor and moved forward to the next observatory position which had been selected by the boats, and then another boat party was sent ahead.¹⁸

Vancouver had a diplomatic task to perform when he met the Spaniard Quadra at Nootka which need not concern us here, except to note that, in order to report to the British government a stalemate in his negotiations, he dispatched first Zachary Mudge westabout via Macao, and then Broughton eastabouts from the west coast of Mexico.

These officers reached England three years before Vancouver's return, just when Bligh was arriving home on the *Providence* from his second and successful breadfruit voyage from Tahiti to the West Indies. The *Providence*, a copper-sheathed sloop well suited for cruising in uncharted waters, was recommissioned under the command of Broughton, with Mudge as his first lieutenant, and sailed for the Pacific in 1794 to continue Vancouver's work.

Calling at Nootka, Broughton found a message from Vancouver indicating that surveying of the east side of the Pacific had been largely

¹⁸G. S. Ritchie, *The Admiralty Chart-British Naval Hydrography in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Hollis and Carter, 1967), pp. 41 and 42.

completed; accordingly Broughton and Mudge, "second generation" Cook surveyors, as we might term them, embarked on charting the coasts of Asia and Japan, and employed the methods they had learnt from Vancouver.

Bligh's achievement in taking the *Providence* through the dangerous and uncharted Torres Straits in nineteen days demonstrates something of what he had learnt as Cook's master on the *Resolution*. He later carried out coastal surveys including those of Dublin Bay and Dungeness.

Accompanying Bligh on the *Providence* had been a young man of eighteen, Matthew Flinders. He had been placed in charge of the time-keepers and had learnt from his Captain how to navigate through dangerous waters. His long voyage with Bligh developed in Flinders an intense ambition to chart unknown seas himself. From then on Flinders devoted his life to exploration, and in 1801 he sailed from England in command of the *Investigator* for his great Australian surveys. In his journals he makes reference more than once to the methods of "the great Captain Cook" which he was successfully following.¹⁹

In 1771, Murdoch Mackenzie was relieved as the Admiralty surveyor by his nephew of the same name; the old man settled down to write his *Treatise on Maritime Surveying*, published in 1774.²⁰

In 1773, Graeme Spence was appointed as assistant to Murdoch Mackenzie, Jr., and they worked together along the south coast of England. In 1788, the Admiralty ceased the permanent employment of civilian hydrographic surveyors and Spence thereafter worked both for Trinity House and the Admiralty as required until his retirement from active fieldwork in 1803.

In his *Treatise* Murdoch Mackenzie, Sr., refers to an instrumental solution to the resection problem which would enable the surveyor to plot the position of a sounding vessel using horizontal sextant angles observed from the boat between three triangulated stations on shore. Robinson demonstrates that Murdoch Mackenzie, Jr., and Graeme Spence developed the station pointer, which was being manufactured by Troughton, the instrument maker, by the turn of the century.

The station pointer was not available to Cook, and almost certainly not to Vancouver, Bligh, Broughton, or Flinders. However, station pointers, together with improved sextants, both benefiting from high

¹⁹Matthew Flinders, *A Voyage to Terra Australis* (London: G. & W. Nicol, 1814).

²⁰Murdoch Mackenzie, *A Treatise on Marine Surveying. Corrected and republished with a supplement by James Horsburg* (London: Black, Kingsbury, Parbury, and Allen, 1819).

quality angular division of the arc (made possible with Troughton's dividing engine which he had developed from that of Rawsden), were ready in time to revolutionize hydrography when the British naval surveying service came into being during Captain Hurd's term of office as hydrographer of the Navy 1808-1823.²¹

Had he lived to return from his third voyage to the Pacific, Cook might well have become the first British hydrographer of the Navy; as it was, a talented civilian, Alexander Dalrymple, already serving as hydrographer to the East India Company, was appointed to the newly established post in 1795. His terms of reference directed him to review all existing hydrographic information in order to supply selected material to the commander of English ships, rather than commissioning more fieldwork. This work he performed to the best of his ability with the very small staff allocated to him.²²

A naval officer, Captain Hurd, took over from Dalrymple in 1808, the first of the long line of twenty naval hydrographers up to the present day. Hurd's early hydrographic training is obscure. His obituary in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of 1823,²³ read in conjunction with Dawson's *Memoirs of Hydrography*,²⁴ and a reference in Professor Evan's *Uncommon Obdurate*²⁵ leads one to believe that he had learnt surveying from Samuel Holland in North America in the years 1771 to 1774. He was appointed surveyor general of Cape Breton sometime after 1780, a post from which he was dismissed by Des Barres, who had become governor of Cape Breton in 1784. By 1788 he was commencing a remarkably detailed survey of Bermuda and remained there to establish a base for the Navy. During the first ten years of the new century Hurd was often on the enemy's doorstep, surveying the Bay of Brest in support of the British blockading forces.

As a young man surveying in North America, Hurd would have learnt Cook's hydrographic methods from Holland, probably from Des Barres, and possibly from Lane. As one of the few naval officers em-

²¹Robinson, pp. 60-70.

²²Sir Archibald Day, *The Admiralty Hydrographic Service, 1795-1919* (London: H. M. S. O., 1967). Order in Council "Establishment of an Hydrographic Department dated 12 August 1795" is reprinted in full in Appendix A1, pp. 334-335.

²³Obituary of Captain Thomas Hurd in *Gentleman's Magazine*, 93 (1823).

²⁴Llewellyn S. Dawson, *Memoirs of Hydrography*, 2 vols. (Eastbourne: H. W. Keay, 1883-1885). Facsimile reprint with four-page Errata was published by Commarket Press, London, 1969. Hurd referred to p. 45.

²⁵Evans, p. 96.

ployed in chartmaking he would certainly have studied Captain Vancouver's *Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean and Round the World* (published in London in 1798), and Captain Broughton's *Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean* (published in London in 1804). Both these explorers were employing and developing Cook's methods. From 1810 onwards, Hurd was closely associated with Captain Flinders, who was preparing the manuscript and charts for his *Voyage to Terra Australis* (published in London in 1814). Even if Hurd never met Cook he would have been aware of the broad pattern for chartmaking set by the great sea surveyor before his untimely death only thirty years earlier.

In 1814, Hurd made a report to Their Lordships detailing the many areas of the world's oceans which should be surveyed to meet the fleet's charting requirements. The introductory and concluding paragraphs of this report read as follows:

The return of Peace to this Country makes me consider it as an official duty to represent to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty the great deficiency of our Nautical knowledge in almost every part of the World, but more particularly on the coastline of our own Dominions, and also with the hopes that the present favourable moment for remedying these evils will be made use of, by calling into employment those of our Naval Officers, whose scientific merits point them out as qualified for undertakings of this nature—of which description of Officers there are I am happy to say many who stand eminently conspicuous.

In acquiring the Nautical knowledge here recommended, much good might also result therefrom in other points of view as an excellent opportunity would thereby be afforded for the exertions of abilities both scientific and commercial, by uniting as Companions of their researches, persons of the description who of course would become accountable to the Nation for all the knowledge they might thereby acquire. At all events such an undertaking would keep alive the active services of many meritorious officers whose abilities would not be permitted to lie dormant, whilst they can be turned to National benefit and would also be the means of acquiring a mass of valuable information that could not fail of being highly advantageous to us in any future War, and would otherways redound to the Credit

and Glory of this great Maritime Empire, whose flag flies triumphant in every part of the World.²⁶

A corps of officers, selected for their mathematical and navigational abilities to carry out the hydrographer's instructions worldwide were gradually built up by Hurd. The founding of the Royal Naval Surveying Service may be taken as 7 January 1817, when a board minute established special rates of pay for officers specializing in hydrography. These "Companions of their researches" as Hurd called them, hardly ever exceeded sixty in number, have remained as a coherent body of chartmakers to the present day, whilst a number of Commonwealth navies have formed similar if smaller corps.

The civilian hydrographers had been active since the beginning of the century; the methods described in Murdoch Mackenzie's *Treatise*²⁷ had been assimilated by Cook and others and extended to meet the needs of ocean and exploration surveys. Cook did not live to write a manual but Hurd established the new body of specialists on Cook's principles, and these were passed on traditionally by surveying captains to their surveying assistants who in their turn gained command.

One may follow many such lines of descent, one only of which is given here as an example. John Franklin served with Flinders on the *Investigator* during the surveys of Australia and was associated with Flinders when he returned to England from Mauritius in 1810.

Beechey accompanied Lieutenant Franklin on Captain David Buchan's expedition towards the North Pole in 1818 and later commanded the *Blossom*, in which he waited in vain off Icy Cape in the Bering Sea for the planned arrival of Captain Franklin's overland expedition in search of the Northwest Passage. On board the *Blossom* was Lieutenant Belcher, who surveyed Chamisso Harbour during the long wait.

Belcher later claimed that he had learnt nothing from Beechey and was self-taught; but we have learnt to take Belcher's statements with a "pinch of salt." After having commanded the surveying ships *Aetna* and *Sulphur*, he published in 1835 a treatise on nautical surveying.²⁸ Although this treatise was rambling and diffuse, it served a useful purpose until Captain Beechey's admirable section of "Hydrography" was pub-

²⁶Day, pp. 27, 29.

²⁷Mackenzie.

²⁸Sir Edward Belcher, *A Treatise on Nautical Surveying*... (London: P. Richardson, 1835).

lished in the *Admiralty Manual of Scientific Enquiry* in 1851.²⁹ Belcher's First Lieutenant on the *Aetna* was Kellett, who later, as a captain, commanded the *Herald* surveying in the Pacific, with Lieutenant Chimmo as one of his assistants.

In 1864, Commander Chimmo was in command of the *Gannet*, a surveying vessel on the North American and West Indies Station, in which also served Lieutenant Wharton, who became, twenty years later, the eighth hydrographer of the Navy.

Rear Admiral Sir William Wharton served twenty years as hydrographer, into the twentieth century. In 1882 he published his *Hydrographical Surveying*,³⁰ which remained, with new editions, the standard English language work on hydrography for the next fifty years. Aware of Cook's continuing influence upon the Royal Navy's hydrographic services during the nineteenth century, Wharton edited and published for the first time in 1893 Cook's own journals of the *Endeavour* voyage exactly as Cook had written them.³¹

What were Cook's contributions which have continued to influence hydrography during two centuries? An attempt will be made to enumerate them:

Firstly, his attention to the good health of his ships' companies without which no hydrographic venture can be successful. He fought scurvy incessantly, imposing by personal example a wholesome diet which he had devised, whilst his forethought prevented his men from ever being seriously short of food or water. In his early days on the *Grenville*, he realized the necessity, sometimes denied even today, of carrying a doctor on board a working vessel when far from her base.

Secondly, we note his obvious desire, at a time when new instruments were being rapidly introduced, to have on board the latest and best when he sailed. He ordered the instruments himself and he and his officers soon mastered them: the most carefully engraved sextants, the newest timepieces, up-to-date azimuth compasses; he never missed purchasing these for his voyages.

²⁹Sir John F. W. Herschel, ed., *Admiralty Manual of Scientific Enquiry* (London: J. Murray, 1851). Reprinted and published by William Dawson and Sons Ltd., Folkestone, 1974. This edition includes an introduction by David Knight which reviews the relationship between science and the Royal Navy during the nineteenth century. Section III, *Hydrography* by Captain F. W. Beechey is reprinted on pp. 52-107.

³⁰Sir William J. L. Wharton, *Hydrographical Surveying* (London: J. Murray, 1882).

³¹Sir William J. L. Wharton, ed., *Captain Cook's Journal during his First Voyage Round the world . . . 1768-1771* (London: E. Stock, 1893), reprinted Adelaide: Libraries Board of South Australia, the Australian Facsimile Editions No. 188, 1968.)

Thirdly, there is his feeling for science; although he sometimes found the presence of scientists on board tedious, his association with Banks, Solander, and the Forsters undoubtedly broadened his mental horizons far beyond those of a practical seaman. His ever-widening interest in the natural sciences—meteorology, oceanography, anthropology, and biology—and his habit of continual inquiry during his voyages constituted a precedent. Hydrographic surveyors have remained alert to take advantage of their opportunities of adding to the general scientific knowledge of the world. Hydrographers and scientists have sailed together on many subsequent voyages, of which Fitzroy and Darwin on the *Beagle*, Owen Stanley and Huxley on the *Rattlesnake*, and Nares and the *Challenger* scientists are only outstanding examples.

Fourthly, there is his close attention to what is today known as forward planning. This is evident in his organization of the good-weather-season concept when working in Newfoundland, which evinced itself in a grander manner when he came to plan his great exploring sweeps through the Pacific, within an ocean-wide meteorological pattern which was only gradually becoming apparent.

Finally must be listed Cook's absolute dedication to chartmaking which still motivates us today. The search for the cartographic truth despite fatigue, foul weather, and often shortage of time cannot be successfully concluded even with the most sophisticated instrumentation in the modern ship unless the surveyor has inherited that sense of complete determination which Cook so clearly possessed.

REAR ADMIRAL G. S. RITCHIE was born in Burnley, Lancashire, educated at the Royal Naval College, and went to sea in 1932 with the Royal Navy. He served in Labrador, China, the Red Sea, and the Pacific. As hydrographer of the Royal Navy, he wrote *The Challenger and Life of a Survey Ship*. He was awarded the Royal Geographical Society's Back Grant for his contribution to oceanographical exploration of the Pacific. In 1967, his *Admiralty Chart* was published by the American Elsevier Publishing Company. He is now President of the International Hydrographical Organization located in Monte Carlo, Monaco.



CAPTAIN COOK AND OMAI¹

by E. H. McCormick

For a man who attained such eminence before his death, surprisingly little is known of Cook's personal life. Of his relations with parents, wife, family, and fellow Yorkshiremen not much is recorded beyond the bare facts and what is contained in a handful of unrevealing letters. His journals, informative as they are about many subjects, do not often dwell on the friendships—and the animosities—that developed on the quarterdeck or in the confines of the great cabin. Nor do the comments of his contemporaries and shipboard companions penetrate very deeply. "He is," lamented his editor and biographer, "an exceptionally difficult man to get inside."²

There is, however, one association that Cook made that is more fully documented than usual. His first object in the forthcoming voyage, he informed a French correspondent early in 1776, was "*de reconduire Omai dans son île*."³ Omai was a special charge, entrusted to his care by the Admiralty and in particular by the First Lord, the Earl of Sandwich, who was his own patron. So when the *Resolution* set out later in the year, he apparently felt called upon to supply details of the man's conduct both in his journals and his correspondence. And when he was cursory or silent the gaps were often filled by other witnesses keenly interested in the returning celebrity and the comedy-drama of his dealings with Captain Cook. My purpose here is to trace the fluctuating course of their relationship during the period of sixteen months they were together. But, first, a glance at Omai.

He was, as every student of the Pacific knows, the first Polynesian to reach Britain but not the first to visit Europe. He had been preceded by a Tahitian, Ahutoru, taken to France by Bougainville. Omai's early life is obscure and even his original name is uncertain. In the manner

¹A slightly revised version of a paper, "Cook's First Mission on His Third Voyage," presented on 27 April 1978 at the Cook Conference, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C., Canada. The paper in its turn was based on my *Omai, Pacific Envoy* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1977) to which readers are diffidently referred for points of detail. Subsequent footnotes, usually collected under one reference for each paragraph, indicate the source of quotations from other publications.

²J. C. Beaglehole, "On the character of Captain James Cook," *Geographical Journal* 122, part 4 (December 1956), 417.

³James Cook, *The Journals of Captain James Cook*, ed. J. C. Beaglehole, 3 vols. (Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society, 1955-1967), II, 700. Hereafter referred to as "Cook."

of his countrymen he might have changed it more than once and may have decided to call himself Mai because that was the designation of a chiefly family. Through a misunderstanding the English prefixed the article *o* to many personal and geographical nouns, so that Tahiti became known as Otaheite and Mai as Omai. Born in the island of Ra'iatea about 1753 of the "middling" class or *ra'atira*, at the age of ten or so he was overtaken by disaster. His native island was invaded by warriors from neighboring Bora-Bora under their chief Puni and he lost his father in battle. Following this incident, he and other refugees, among them the chief and priest Tupaia, fled to Tahiti, one hundred miles to the southeast. With other relatives he settled on the northern coast of the island.

Thus Omai was there in June 1767 when Captain Samuel Wallis of HMS *Dolphin*, in search of the supposed Southern Continent, lighted on Tahiti. He was only about fourteen years of age, too young to join the warriors in their efforts to repel these unwelcome newcomers; but he was wounded by gunfire in the final clash at Matavai Bay. Apparently he bore the British no resentment, for he was one of the admiring throng that greeted the *Endeavour* a couple of years later. Led by Lieutenant James Cook, this expedition came to observe the transit of Venus across the sun and brought two members of the Royal Society, Joseph Banks and Daniel Carl Solander. On leaving Matavai Bay, Banks took with him as human specimens Tupaia and a young servant, both of whom died at Batavia on the homeward voyage. Some time later Omai seems to have made his way back to Ra'iatea to join in an unsuccessful attempt to dislodge the Bora-Boran usurpers. He narrowly escaped death and sought refuge in nearby Huahine.

He was still at Huahine in September 1773 during a brief visit of the *Resolution* and the *Adventure* in the course of Cook's second voyage. It was originally intended that Banks and Solander should again set out, but as the result of a quarrel with his old friend Sandwich, Banks withdrew at the last moment. Omai for his part became a favorite of men on the *Adventure* and, with the consent of its captain, Tobias Furneaux, embarked as a supernumerary under the name Tetuby Homy. Cook was not impressed by the volunteer, describing him in his journal as "dark, ugly and a downright blackguard."⁴ At the island of Tongatapu he was further disappointed when neither Omai nor his own recruit, Hitihiti, could understand the local language, though it was closely related to their own tongue. However, he gave grudging approval to

⁴Cook, II, 428, n. 2.

Furneaux's action, doubtless in the belief that both men would be restored to their homes on his return to the Society Islands later in the voyage. As it proved, the *Adventure* failed to return. The two ships parted in a storm off the New Zealand coast and by the time the *Adventure* limped into the agreed rendezvous at Queen Charlotte Sound the *Resolution* had already left. On the eve of his own departure Furneaux sent some of his men to gather greens. When they failed to reappear, a search party went out, only to discover the mangled remains of their companions and on a neighboring hill natives in the midst of a cannibal feast. Furneaux gave up all thought of rejoining Cook and immediately made for home. After calling at the Cape of Good Hope, he reached Spithead on 14 July 1774 and set out for London with his living trophy from the South Seas.

So it came about that an average Polynesian had been picked up and, more or less by accident, transported across the world. Omai or Omiah, as he was now called, met Lord Sandwich, who handed him over to Banks, delighted to heal the breach with his friend and take charge of this unexpected replacement for the dead Tupaia. A few days later he was presented to George III and launched into society. Circumstances could scarcely have been more favorable for his reception. The educated public, already familiar with the ideas of Rousseau, had in the recent past been both instructed and entertained by varied accounts of the Pacific. These ranged from Bougainville's lyrical descriptions of New Cythera, as he named Tahiti, to a sensational narrative of the *Endeavour* expedition and verse satires on Banks's supposed amours with the "Queen" of Tahiti. Above all, thousands of readers had perused and pondered over the three volumes of Hawkesworth's epic of British discovery in the South Seas. In Omai they saw not merely a denizen of this fabled region, the representative of a new race, but the embodiment of that philosophical abstraction, natural man. His success was assured. For the two years of his stay he was fêted by aristocrats, entertained by the Royal Society, depicted by leading artists, and introduced to such celebrities as Dr. Johnson, Mrs. Thrale, and Fanny Burney. Sandwich had him to stay at his country house and took him for a long cruise on his yacht. Banks was his escort in the world of fashion and carried him on tours through the English countryside. They had set off on a visit to Mulgrave Castle in Yorkshire when the *Resolution* returned in the summer of 1775.

Cook's immediate response to the situation he found is, alas, not on record. He was doubtless surprised when he discovered from Solander and other visitors to the *Resolution* that the ill-favored, undistinguished

islander he had met briefly in the South Seas had become the lion of high society. And, touching him even more closely, he must have learned with mixed feelings that this low-born native was the favorite of his own patron Lord Sandwich, the protégé of his friend and mentor Banks. With his appointment as leader of the new expedition in February 1776 he accepted responsibility for carrying Omai back to the Pacific and restoring him to his people. In the months that followed both men were fully occupied, Cook with preparations for the voyage, Omai with instructions in the elements of English and social engagements in a circle that now included Mrs. Thrale and her friends. They must, however, have met each other, though there is only indirect evidence of the fact. Entering his journal early in April 1776, James Boswell described a conversation he held with Cook at a dinner given by the president of the Royal Society. At one point they discussed Omai, who was about to go home, and who, according to Cook, "begged" to take back two things, port wine, "which he loved the best of any liquor," and gunpowder. The captain went on to say that he would not let Omai have the power of firearms and foretold that for a time he would be "a man of great consequence" but would then sink into his former state and want to return to England.⁵

His remarks to Boswell were not Cook's last words on Omai before he again set out on the *Resolution*. Assisted by Dr. John Douglas, Canon of Windsor, and to a lesser extent by Lord Sandwich, he had in the previous months been preparing the journal of his second voyage for publication. In describing the visit to Huahine in 1773, he made handsome amends for his slighting reference to Omai as "dark, ugly and a downright blackguard." Deleting that passage, he wrote more mildly that he had rather wondered that Captain Furneaux should pick up this man who had no advantage in birth or rank and no distinction of shape, figure, or complexion. But since his arrival in England, he candidly confessed, he had been convinced of his error and now doubted whether any other native would have given greater satisfaction. He went on to list Omai's virtues—his "very good understanding," his "honest principles," the "natural good behaviour, which rendered him acceptable to the best company," and the "proper degree of pride, which taught him to avoid the society of persons of inferior rank." Then followed a tribute to his sobriety, ascribed to the example set by "the persons of rank who honoured him with their protection." Certain of these

⁵Charles Ryskamp and Frederick A. Pottle, eds., *Boswell: The Ominous Years 1774-1776* (London: Heinemann, 1963, pp. 310-311.

persons were specified in a paragraph summarizing the events of his stay. Soon after his arrival, it opened, the First Lord introduced him to His Majesty at Kew. There he met with "a most gracious reception, and imbibed the strongest impression of duty and gratitude to that great and amiable prince"—an impression, it was predicted, that he would "preserve to the latest moment of his life." During his sojourn, the account continued, "he was caressed by many of the principal nobility, and did nothing to forfeit the esteem of any of them; but his principal patrons were the Earl of Sandwich, Mr. Banks, and Dr. Solander." Though Omai lived in the midst of amusements in England, it was observed, the return to his native country was always in his thoughts and, while not impatient to go, he expressed satisfaction as the time approached. "He embarked with me in the *Resolution*," the passage ended, "... loaded with presents from his several friends, and full of gratitude for the kind reception and treatment he had experienced among us."⁶

In the final sentence Cook was anticipating future events. They did not leave until 24 June 1776, from which date their joint actions are amply documented. It was Cook himself from his special vantage point who opened the saga of Omai's return. They set out for the ship at six o'clock in the morning, he wrote in his journal on 24 June, and reached Chatham some five hours later. On the road from London, he recalled, his companion displayed "a Mixture of regret and joy: in speaking of England and such persons as had honoured him [with] their protection and friendship he would be very low spirited and with difficulty refrain from tears; but turn the conversation to his Native Country and his eyes would sparkle with joy." He was "fully sensible of the good treatment he had met with in England" and "entertained the highest ideas of the Country and people." On the other hand, "the prospect he now had of returning to his native isle loaded with what they esteem riches, got the better of every other consideration, and he seemed quite happy." The riches included a suit of armor, an electrical machine, and an assortment of European clothing; in addition, the ship carried animals and birds for distribution in the Pacific, among them a flock of sheep and a peacock and hen. Cook omitted such details but again listed Omai's principal benefactors and concluded with an illuminating comment which had no parallel in his earlier report: "In short every method had been taken both during his aboad in England and at his depar-

⁶James Cook, *A Voyage towards the South Pole*, 2 vols. (London: Strahan and Cadell, 1777), I, 169-171.

ture to make him convey to his Countrymen the highest opinion of the greatness and generosity of the British Nation.”⁷

Journal entries for the Channel passage yield only one reference to Omai who, it was recorded, did not go ashore at Deal “to the great disappointment of many people . . . assembled there to see him.” Omai-watchers had better luck at Plymouth, for, as Cook wrote to Banks on 10 July, he was “very much carressed” by “every person of note” in that city. He had received three guineas pocket money, was consequently in high spirits, and sent his “best respects” to Mr. Banks and Dr. Solander. Cook had already acknowledged receipt of his secret instructions which stated: “Upon your arrival at Otaheite, or the Society Isles, you are to land Omiah at such of them as he may chuse and to leave him there.”⁸ To give effect to this and more elaborate directions he set off on the 12th, leaving the *Discovery* to follow when its commander, Captain Charles Clerke, should be released from legal entanglements in London.

There was little to report as the *Resolution* made for the Cape of Good Hope by way of Tenerife. Towards the end of August they were in tropical waters, where on the 23rd Cook noted a great many small dolphins of which they caught several with a white fly and rod. “Omai,” he commented, “first showed us the way and caught twice the number of any body besides.” His slightly cryptic tribute was followed two months later by a letter to Sandwich. “I embrace the first [opportunity],” he wrote from Cape Town on 23 October, “to acquaint your Lordship with my safe arrival at this place, with Omai, and every Animal intend[ed] for Otaheite in a fair way of living to arrive at their destined spot.” At that time he was still waiting for the *Discovery*, but on 26 November he again wrote to the First Lord to inform him that the ship had now joined them and they would soon leave for the south. “The takeing on board some horses has made Omai compleatly happy,” Cook went on, “he consented with raptures to give up his Cabbin to make room for them, his only concern now is that we shall not have food for all the stock we have got on board.” There followed reassuring references to his “good state of health and great flow of Spirits” and a final tribute to his personal qualities: “Sence he has been with me I have not had the least reason to find fault with any part of his conduct and the people here are surprised at his genteel behaviour and deportment.” The same day a letter went to Banks conveying similar senti-

⁷Cook, III, 5.

⁸Cook, III, ccxxi, 6, 1511.

ments often phrased in identical terms. Omai, wrote Cook, enjoyed good health, and his conduct since he left England had not given the least cause for complaint. "He desires," the letter continued, "his best respects to you, Dr Solander, Lord Seaford and to a great many more, Ladies as well as Gentlemen, whose names I cannot insert because they would fill up this sheet of paper, I can only say that he does not forget any who have shewed him the least kindness."⁹

By the end of November the *Resolution*, loaded with supplies and animals, lacked only a few females of their own species to become "a Compleate ark," as Cook jested in writing to Sandwich. On 1 December the two ships weighed anchor to head southeast in search of land already reported by French explorers. During this episode, which resulted in the sighting and naming of several bleak islands, Cook made no mention of Omai. He was preoccupied with navigational problems in these hazardous waters and also with the plight of his live cargo. After losing many animals through cold and hunger he decided to seek milder weather and fresh fodder in Van Diemen's Land. There it was, on 27 January 1777, that Omai emerged from the obscurity which had enveloped him in the two months since he left the Cape. Once more he won praise for his skill as a fisherman and through an encounter with the unsophisticated aborigines was again referred to in the captain's journal. One of the natives, wrote Cook, set up a stick to aim at but proved himself a poor marksman; whereupon "Omai to shew them how much superior our weapons were to theirs, fired his musket at the Mark, on which they instantly ran into the woods. . . ."¹⁰ It was a trifling incident in a brief visit that did something to restore both "cattle" and men. On the 30th they set out for New Zealand, where they arrived on 12 February.

When they entered the familiar haven of Queen Charlotte Sound, Omai was in the forefront—a position he was to hold for the next eight months. Waving a handkerchief, he announced to the occupants of several canoes that "Toote" had returned. They seemed reluctant to approach, fearing, Cook supposed, that he had come to revenge the death of Captain Furneaux's sailors. Nor did Omai help matters by speaking openly of the massacre. Gradually, however, they were won over and boarded the ships to pay their respects and engage in barter. Among the visitors two were specially noted: the first a handsome youth about seventeen years of age, Te Weherua by name, remembered for his

⁹Cook, III, 14 n. 3, 1515, 1520, 1521.

¹⁰Cook, III, 53, 1520.

friendliness and honesty during earlier visits; the other a chief of sinister mien, known as Kahourah, reputedly a leader of the band which had killed and eaten the *Adventure's* men. Cook made every effort to discover details of the affair and four days after their arrival led a large party to the scene of the attack.

During the excursion—indeed throughout the whole visit—Omai acted as interpreter. This was a little surprising, for on the previous voyage he had shown no linguistic aptitude whatsoever; seemingly with enhanced social status he had acquired the gift of tongues! Cook described him speaking to a ring of attentive listeners and elsewhere said quite explicitly that he understood the New Zealand language “perfectly well.” On the present occasion he collected eyewitness accounts of the fatal affray which tended to show, as Cook observed, that “the thing was not premeditated” but had arisen from thefts committed by the New Zealanders and “too hastily resented” by the *Adventure's* men. For these reasons, in spite of contrary advice from other members of the expedition and even from the natives themselves, he decided not to punish any of the guilty warriors, of whom Kahourah was the most notorious. Omai was outraged by the decision, protesting to the captain: “why do you not kill him, you tell me if a man kills an other in England he is hanged for it, this Man has killed ten and yet you will not kill him, tho a great many of his countrymen desire it and it would be very good.”¹¹

Along with the principles of British justice Omai had picked up from his high-born patrons notions of the privileges befitting a man of rank. For some time before they reached New Zealand, Cook explained, his protégé had “express’d a desire to take one of the Natives with him to his own Country.” He wished, in fact, to enlist the nucleus of an entourage. A suitable recruit soon appeared in the person of the amiable youth Te Weherua who volunteered his services and came to live on the ship. Thinking he would leave after getting what he could from Omai, Cook at first paid little attention, but when he stayed on it looked as if Omai had deceived the young New Zealander and his family by telling them he would be brought back. “I therefore caused it to be made known to all of them,” Cook emphasized, “that if he went away with us he would never return, but this seemed to make no sort of impression on either him or his friends.”¹² Te Weherua persisted in his resolve and, since he was of chiefly rank, another youth was chosen

¹¹Cook, III, 62, 64, 68.

¹²Cook, III, 69–70.

to go as his servant. He, however, left the ship, to be replaced at the last moment by a boy named Koa, about nine or ten years of age.

Thus, to please Omai and minister to his vanity, Cook had broken one of his inflexible rules. Up to this point he had taken on islanders for limited voyages but had refused to remove them permanently from their homes and had given Tupaia a passage only when Banks accepted full responsibility for the chief's future. Now he was condemning the two New Zealanders to lifelong exile—an action that obviously concerned him deeply. He again pointed out the improbability, or rather impossibility, of their return, but to no effect. "Not one," he wrote, "even their nearest relations seem to trouble themselves about what became of them." Despite his own misgivings, he allowed Omai to carry them off, the more willingly, he remarked, because he "was well satisfied the boys would not be losers by exchange of place"—an allusion, it would seem, to the insecurity of life in their native land and the cannibalistic habits of their countrymen.¹³

On 25 February the ships left Queen Charlotte Sound, soon heading northeast for Tahiti. At first Omai's retainers, seasick as well as homesick, regretted their decision and for days on end wept inconsolably. But in time, according to Cook, "the tumult of their minds began to subside" and they thought no more of friends or country. He himself seems to have forgotten the exiles—or at least to have ignored them in his journal—until they parted in the following November. During this stage of the voyage, as they entered the tropics after more than a month at sea, he had urgent problems of his own to consider. He had hoped that the supplies taken on at New Zealand would last until they reached Tahiti, but progress was slow and before the end of March both fodder for the animals and water were running out. On the 29th land came into view, the island of Mangaia, southernmost of the group which now bears Cook's name. Though the place seemed to offer all they needed, the inhabitants rejected Omai's overtures, while a coral reef made landing hazardous, if not impossible. They could do nothing but sail on until, a couple of days later, they reached Atiu where the people resembled those of Mangaia but were more friendly. Led by a chief carrying a coconut branch, the token of peace, men came on board to be greeted by Omai who understood them "perfectly" and made the correct responses to their incantations.¹⁴ He guided them over the ship and in return for their presents, Cook noted, gave them a

¹³Cook, III, 70.

¹⁴Cook, III, 76, 81 n. 4.

prized dog he had brought from England. Altogether, conditions seemed most propitious, but alas there was no anchorage and again no break in the encircling barrier. In desperation Cook arranged for a boating party to make for the reef whence they would be carried ashore in canoes. Omai was the go-between in negotiations with the natives and, as usual, the interpreter.

After spending a whole day on the island, the frustrated mariners returned to the ships at nightfall. Not only had they failed to gather any supplies worth mentioning but they had lost all their loose possessions and, in the opinion of some, had survived only because of Omai's presence. Throughout their stay they had been pestered and pilfered by a vast throng of islanders who turned a deaf ear to their requests while firmly resisting all attempts to escape. At one point Omai was greatly alarmed to see an earth oven being heated, but his fears were allayed when a pig was brought for roasting. He eased the tension by taking a club to show how it was used in his country and, as darkness fell, surprised and intimidated the spectators by lighting a small pile of gunpowder. In short, he was the hero of the occasion and received praise on all sides for his courage and resourcefulness. In his version of the proceedings Cook, who had remained on the *Resolution*, paid a deserved tribute to the young man's loyalty to Britain and his command of hyperbole. "Omai," he wrote, "was asked a great many questions concerning us, our Ships, Country and according to his account the answers he gave were many of them not a little upon the marvellous as for instance he told them we had Ships as large as their islands, that carried guns so large that several people might sit within them and that one of these guns was sufficient to distroy the whole island at one shot."¹⁵

While the episode had relieved the monotony of the voyage, it had added nothing to the ships' resources. They did, however, gather some meager supplies from the desert islet off Takutea and then made for the Hervey Islands. Here they were again greeted by hostile natives and, since a landing proved impossible, Cook was forced to take stock of the situation. Disappointed at every landfall since leaving New Zealand, held back by contrary winds, he concluded that he could not possibly reach the Northern Hemisphere in time to carry out his Arctic mission in the coming summer. Everything must now be done not only to save the animals but to conserve stores so that the search for a northern passage could be made a year later than originally intended.

¹⁵Cook, III, 86.

Instead of continuing towards Tahiti, therefore, he directed his course toward the Tongan Archipelago which he had twice visited during the previous expedition and, because of the unstinted hospitality of its people, named the Friendly Isles.

Hardly had Cook recorded this decision, early in April, when fate relented. On the 13th they sighted an uninhabited islet of the Palmerston atoll, not easy of access but, it proved the following day, covered with coarse grass and young coconut trees. These with other vegetation were gathered for the famished animals by foragers who also profited from the abundant resources of the lagoon. Omai, Cook's escort when he left the *Resolution*, was now in his element. As the grateful captain acknowledged, he "caught with a scoop net in a very short time as much fish as served the whole party for dinner, besides sending some to both ships."¹⁶ He demonstrated other talents by preparing delicious meals in an earth oven heated by stones (an accomplishment he had displayed to his hosts in England), and he showed his companions how to obtain fresh water by digging in the sand. During excursions to this and neighboring islets he in turn was escorted by his two retainers and was so delighted by the whole place that he announced his intention of returning to become "King." It was a brief but happy interlude, perhaps the high point of his association with Cook before both became embroiled in the complexities of life in the Friendly and Society Islands. At sunset on 17 April they left the atoll, reaching their anchorage at Nomuka a fortnight later.

This was Omai's second visit to the group. In October 1773 he had landed at Tongatapu, an inconspicuous native of lowly origins and doubtful character, and had been dismissed by Cook for his total failure to comprehend the local language. Now he accompanied the captain ashore, thenceforward to act as interpreter and intermediary in all dealings with the islanders. Soon, observed Mr. King of the *Resolution*, he had gathered an audience who paid him great attention and listened with awe to the stories he told about "Britannee." He was the go-between in trade and, in return for articles brought from England, laid in for himself a stock of the red feathers, so plentiful here, so rare and precious in his own islands. Reverting to Polynesian custom, he often slept on shore with the "wife" supplied by his hosts and within a few days had acquired an influential patron, Finau. This chief came from Tongatapu and was introduced to the skeptical Cook as "King of all the friendly isles." Whatever his true status, he was powerless to pre-

¹⁶Cook, III, 93.

vent his countrymen from pilfering—the one defect that marred their otherwise exemplary conduct. At the end of ten days the navigators had, as Cook confessed, “quite exhausted the island of all most every thing it produced” and must move on.¹⁷ Following Finau’s advice, they made for Lifuka in the northeast.

The stay on that island marked the idyllic climax of the visit to Tonga and perhaps of the entire voyage. On their arrival, with Omai, Finau, and other dignitaries, Cook landed, to receive a welcome far more elaborate than any he had experienced before. Two lines of natives appeared bearing gifts which they placed in separate piles, one for Omai and the other, twice as large, for Cook. The guests, surrounded by thousands of spectators, were next diverted by varied entertainments, while they in return staged military exercises and at nightfall let off rockets. Omai again seized the opportunity to emphasize British power, pointing out how easy it was for his companions to destroy not only the earth but water and sky. These and other spectacles opened an episode marred rather less than elsewhere by pilfering. One important chief, however, was caught stealing a cat. Consulted about the matter, Omai recommended a sentence of a hundred lashes on the grounds that the higher the criminal’s rank the more serious his misdemeanor. In the end, after receiving a token punishment of one lash, the man was set free. Towards the end of May, since provisions were once more running low, Finau set off on a foraging expedition to the north. In his absence a man called Paulaho turned up to announce that he, and he alone, was king of the islands. Omai, reported Cook, “was a good deal chagrined” to find there was someone who might be greater than his own patron.¹⁸ But before the question could be settled they left Lifuka to continue their locustlike progress through the archipelago. On 10 June they reached Tongatapu which was meant to be their last anchorage.

The final weeks in Tonga were marred by signs of discord on all sides. In a confrontation between the two royal pretenders Paulaho had already proved his superior status, but Finau retained some authority—sufficient at any rate for him to offer Omai the chieftainship of the island of Eua. The honor seems to have gone to the chief-presumptive’s head, for in a quarrel with a sentry he struck the man, who had the impudence to return the blow. Highly incensed, Omai complained to Cook and when the captain refused to interfere stalked off with his retainers, vowing he would settle here and travel no farther. Somehow

¹⁷Cook, III, 100, 102.

¹⁸Cook, III, 116.

the affair was patched up, only to be followed by a further difference involving the Tongans. These hospitable people, now perhaps a little weary of their importunate guests, were beginning to treat them coldly and sometimes with violence. One day they set upon a shooting party from the *Resolution* and robbed them. On their return the victims asked Omai to intercede with his royal friends for the return of their possessions. He complied, but Finau and Paulaho, fearing the captain's wrath, fled the neighborhood and returned only when assured that he did not hold them responsible for the assault. He was "very much displeased" by the incident, Cook wrote in his journal, and "gave Omai a reprimand for meddling in it." All things considered, it was high time they moved on. As a farewell gesture, Cook decided to present the chiefs with some of his livestock, but the decision again led to friction with Omai who claimed that the cattle were meant for him. Nevertheless, at the captain's prompting, he told Finau and other friends "that there were no such animals within many Months sail of them, that they had been brought them at a vast trouble and expence, and therefore they were not to kill any until they became very numerous, and lastly, they and their Children were to remember that they had them from the men of Britane." Before leaving the islands the ships called briefly at Eua. Cook thought Omai might have remained there to become chief had he himself consented to the scheme. As it was, he disapproved, though he added darkly, "it was not because I thought he would do better in his own Native isle."¹⁹ So it was with some misgivings over the future of his charge that he set off for Tahiti on 17 July.

His fears were more than confirmed in the period of nearly two months they spent on the island. Arriving off Vaitepiha Bay on 12 August, they were hailed by natives who climbed aboard from their canoes to see old acquaintances and engaged in barter. With great emotion Omai greeted his countrymen and when embracing one who turned out to be his brother-in-law displayed "marks of strong feeling & great tenderness." They for their part responded "rather Coldly than cordially" until he took them below to distribute gifts of the red feathers he had brought from Tonga. Then all was changed. The Tahitians now began to "caress" Omai, while those who had previously treated him with indifference overwhelmed him with presents or sent ashore for produce in return for the precious mementoes. His brother-in-law, a man of "most forbidding countenance," was specially singled out for

¹⁹Cook, III, 133, 137, 158.

censure by critical observers, but his sister fared rather better. She arrived in tears to welcome her brother in a scene that Cook found "extremely moving and better conceived than described." She, too, received her quota of red feathers and so did "all who had the art to profess friendship," remarked the disapproving Mr. King. The same officer is a witness to differences of opinion which, already aired on the *Resolution*, would further mar the relations between Cook and his charge. During the voyage, King said, the captain had repeatedly urged Omai to do everything possible to conserve the riches he had brought from England and secure his own "consequence," "but he would never listen to any plan, except that of destroying the bora bora chiefs & freeing his Native Island." "Omai," King ended, "was not the least obstinate & it answered a bad end, in making him rather fear than love the Captⁿ." ²⁰

For the remainder of their stay in the southern part of the island the young man persisted in his wilful course. When they went ashore to attend the first ceremonial welcome, he displayed none of the sartorial good taste which had won him praise in England. On the contrary, to Cook's displeasure, he arrayed himself "not in English dress, nor in Otaheite, nor in Tongatabu nor in the dress of any Country upon earth, but in a strange medly of all he was possess'd of." Again, ignoring the captain's advice (and apparently to curry favor with both dignitaries), he offered the youthful chief not only gifts for himself but a rich present of Tongan feathers for dispatch to the high chief Tu in the north. On most nights he stayed ashore and, freed from the restraints of his fellow voyagers, consorted with all and sundry. Cook had witnessed his reception by mercenary relatives and self-styled friends who were, he maintained, in love not with the man but his property and who, but for his red feathers, would not have given him a single coconut. He had not expected anything else, Cook bleakly admitted; still, he had somehow hoped that with the property he now owned Omai would have had the prudence to make himself "respected and even courted by the first persons." Instead, during his sojourn here, he had "rejected the advice of those who wished him well and suffered himself to be duped by every designing knave." ²¹ At the end of ten days they had made the most of local resources—their reason for coming in the first place—and moved on to Matavai Bay.

In spite of past experience, Cook still hoped that Omai might learn to mend his ways; and at the outset of this his final visit to the historic

²⁰Cook, III, 186, 187, 1368–1369, 1370.

²¹Cook, III, 186, 189.

anchorage there seemed grounds for optimism. When they landed to pay their respects to the high chief Tu, he recorded in his journal on 24 August, "Omai was dress'd in his very best suit of clothes and conducted himself with a great deal of respect and Modesty." Approaching the chief (or "King," the designation usually found in the annals of the voyage), he knelt to embrace the monarch's legs. Just as Cook had foreseen, the boy chief at Vaitepiha Bay had kept Omai's costly gift of feathers for himself, sending in its place a small tuft, not a twentieth part of its value. Now the suppliant tried to atone for his lapse by giving Tu a piece of gold cloth and more of the prized feathers. None of the vast assembly seemed to recognize him and no one paid him much attention until later in the morning when they had all made their way to the *Resolution*. Here they were joined by Tu's mother who brought gifts of food and cloth, some for Cook, the rest for Omai. Apparently she had learned of the lowly Ra'iatean's wealth and with other members of her family began to seek his friendship. Cook encouraged them to do so, he explained, because he wished Omai to settle here, knowing that "the farther he was from his native island the better he would be respected." Moreover, he intended leaving most of the livestock in this part of Tahiti and thought Omai "would be able to give some instruction about the Management of them and their use." Without more ado that same afternoon he had a large consignment transported to the neighboring district of Pare where Tu presided. "And now," he wrote, "found my self lightened of a very heavy burden, the trouble and vexation that attended the bringing these Animals thus far is hardly to be conceived."²²

He was equally relieved to learn that Tu favored a marriage between his youngest sister and Omai, who was now living ashore with his relatives who had followed him from Vaitepiha Bay. The proposed alliance with the royal family would have furthered all Cook's aims for his protégé by ensuring his safety, enhancing his status, and keeping him in Tahiti with the animals. But alas for these benevolent intentions, before the marriage could be arranged the prospective bridegroom fell into the clutches of unprincipled "raskels" who contrived to alienate him from Tu and in a nocturnal attack succeeded in robbing him of much of his property. Faced by the collapse of his plans, Cook again complained that the willful young man rejected his advice, acted in such a way as to lose the friendship of Tu and every other person of note, and "associated with none but refugees and strangers whose sole

²²Cook, III, 192, 193, 194.

Views were to plunder him." To save him from ruin the captain felt compelled to impound most of his remaining possessions. Had he not done so, wrote Cook, Omai would not have been left with "a single thing worthe the carrying from the island."²³ As a result, he was reduced to temporary destitution and forced to beg for victuals in order to feed the household he had set up with his family and a growing number of hangers-on.

The two men linked together by an accident of history were not always at odds. Dressed in English uniform, Omai was Cook's aide-de-camp on formal occasions and continued to act as the expedition's interpreter, a role he was, of course, fully qualified to undertake in this part of the Pacific. Despite the breach with Tu, he usually accompanied the captain on his visits to the royal seat at Pare and assisted him in his investigation of local politics and customs. For some years Tu and his ally Tutaha had been at war with a rival faction on the neighboring island of Mo'orea. So far the results had been inconclusive, but at this time the Tahitians were preparing for a decisive onslaught on their enemy. To ensure the success of the invading fleet, which he was to command, Tutaha announced his intention of offering up a human sacrifice. Thinking it, Cook said, "a good oppertunity to see something of this extraordinary and Barborous custom," on the morning of 1 September he set out to attend the ceremony with Omai and other members of the expedition. During the lengthy proceedings the European onlookers restrained their feelings, but at the conclusion they voiced their indignation in a stormy meeting with Tutaha. "Omai was our spokesman," Cook related, "and entered into our arguments with so much Spirit that he put the Chief out of all manner of patience, especially when he was told that if he a Cheif in England had put a man to death as he had done this he would be hanged for it." Whereupon Tutaha "balled out '*Maeno maeno*' (Vile vile) and would not here a nother word; so that we left him with as great a contempt of our customs as we could possibly have of theirs." On his return later in the month after an unsuccessful attack on Mo'orea, Tutaha was magnanimous enough to overlook Omai's part in the incident. In exchange for a gift of red feathers, he presented the young man, as Cook reported, with "a very fine double Sailing Canoe, compleatly equiped Man'd and fit for the Sea."²⁴

²³Cook, III, 193, n. 2.

²⁴Cook, III, 199, 206, 219.

It was a pity, thought his shipmates, that Omai was not settling here to enjoy the patronage and protection of Tutaha, who might thus have taken the place of the affronted Tu. But, scorning the advice of his well-wishers, he refused to remain in Tahiti. So there was nothing for him but to sail on and, as the Lords of the Admiralty had decreed, carry him to the island of his choice. As their stay at Matavai Bay drew to a close, Cook with invincible optimism decided Omai was beginning to act more prudently. The treasure brought from England was somewhat diminished, but he invested a portion of what was left in local cloth and coconut oil, of finer quality than elsewhere in these islands and in great demand for trade. Much of Omai's erratic behavior, in the captain's opinion, had been due to the influence of his relatives and their cronies who had tried to keep him to themselves with the sole aim of stripping him of all he possessed. By taking charge of the residue Cook had frustrated their designs. Now, to prevent further depredations, he forbade Omai's sister and brother-in-law to follow him as they intended. On 29 September they all set out for Mo'orea, only ten miles distant. Cook had not visited the island before but, his curiosity roused by what he had seen in Tahiti, he decided to call there on the way to Huahine. Omai sailed in his own canoe, gaily hung with pennants of his own making and manned by his now considerable band of retainers. Later in the day he was followed by the ships, which reached their destination the next morning.

In the sheltered harbor on the northern coast where they came to anchor, events followed a customary pattern. Curious islanders swarmed round the ships in their canoes or climbed up to welcome the voyagers and engage in barter. The Europeans for their part exchanged trifles for native produce and soon after arriving set up a depot for the collection of wood and water. In addition they landed the remnants of their live cargo—a couple of horses, an assortment of poultry, pigs, some goats—most of them intended for Omai. The days passed without incident and, because supplies were running short at the end of a week, Cook decided to sail on. All was ready for departure when he learned that one of the goats set ashore to graze had been stolen. "The loss . . . would have been nothing," he wrote, "if it had not interfered with my views of Stocking other islands with these Animals but as it did it was necessary to get it again if possible." Acting decisively with the aid of two local elders, he secured the goat's return, only to discover that a second one, a prized female big with kid, had disappeared. He immediately sent out a search party, but the islanders fobbed off the men with empty promises or treated them with ill-concealed derision. "I was now

very sorry I had proceeded so far," Cook admitted, "as I could not retreat with any tolerable credit, and without giving encouragement to the people of the other islands we had yet to visit to rob us with impunity."²⁵

Faced by this awkward situation, the captain consulted Omai and the two elders who told him to go and shoot every soul he met. This "bloody advice" he could not follow, Cook commented, but he resolved to lead an armed party across the island to reassert his damaged prestige and reclaim the lost goat.²⁶ He left at daybreak on 9 October accompanied by the zealous Omai who wanted to fire on the first person they encountered. Cook forbade him to do so and, further, ordered him to make it known that no one would be hurt, much less killed. As a result there was no opposition until they came to the village suspected of harboring the goat. Here armed warriors showered Omai with stones and, even when threatened with the loss of their property, would not admit any knowledge of the stolen animal. Cook accordingly ordered some houses to be burned and several war canoes broken up. Once released the flood of violence was not easily stemmed. For the rest of that day and most of the next Cook led his men through the island in an orgy of looting, burning, and destruction. He had only just got back to the *Resolution* on the evening of the 10th when he learned that during his absence the precious goat had been restored. The spoils of the foray added a quantity of fresh provisions to the ships' stores, but the person who profited most was Omai. He had been in the forefront of the rampage and returned with two more canoes and enough timber to build a European-style house on the island of his preference. The choice had narrowed down to one between his native Ra'iatea and Huahine, whither they directed their course on the morning of the 11th.

At midday on 12 October the ships reached their destination and found that Omai in his large canoe had again outsailed them. He soon boarded the *Resolution* to announce that he wished to settle at Ra'iatea but first wanted his fellow voyagers to help him drive out the Bora-Boran usurpers. Cook flatly refused to have any part in such an invasion and, ignoring the Admiralty's instructions, took the long-deferred decision into his own hands. "Huaheine," he resolved, "was therefore the island to leave him at and no other." Once this question was settled, he acted with his customary vigor. To clinch matters, at a gathering of local chiefs summoned for the purpose, he went ashore the next

²⁵Cook, III, 228, 229.

²⁶Cook, III, 229.

morning with other members of the expedition and Omai. That unpredictable person, he noted, had dressed himself "very properly," brought with him some handsome gifts, and, now he was clear of the "gang" which had surrounded him in Tahiti, was behaving "with such prudence as to gain him respect." After offering tributes to the gods, he gave thanks for his return, not forgetting to mention the high chief of "Pretan" (George III), Lord Sandwich, and the two captains of this expedition.²⁷ Then, prompted by Cook, he addressed the assembled chiefs, first warning them to lay aside their thievish ways. He went on to say that he had been well treated in England and sent back with many articles that would be very useful here. Were the chiefs, then, prepared to give or sell a piece of land where he could build a house for his servants and himself? After due consultation the request was granted. In return for axes, beads, and other trifles, Omai received a small estate extending along the shore and toward the hills.

With this transaction completed, Cook did everything in his power to ensure his protégé's comfort and security. To safeguard the treasure brought from England, he put the carpenters to work building a house from the timber pillaged in Mo'orea and employed other hands to plant a garden with European fruits and vegetables. Omai, he observed, was beginning to attend seriously and now repented his extravagance in Tahiti. A brother and a married sister were living here, but they did not plunder him as his other relatives had done. Still, they were powerless to protect either his person or his property, so, fearing he would be robbed when the ships left, Cook advised him to distribute some of his "Moveables" among the chiefs and in this way secure their favor and support. He adopted the suggestion, which Cook followed up with a promise that anyone who injured his friend would feel the full weight of his "resentment." That this was no empty threat was borne out by the one serious incident to occur during the visit. On the night of 22 October the loss of a sextant was reported to Cook, who had the thief arrested and put in irons on the *Resolution*. Under Omai's insistent questioning he revealed where he had hidden the instrument and, as he appeared to be "a hardened Scounderal," Cook explained, "I punished him with greater severity than I had ever done any one before."²⁸ He omitted details but other chroniclers supplied them. With hair shaved and both ears cut off, the man was put ashore in a bleeding condition as a warning to others. The spectacle certainly inspired horror among

²⁷Cook, III, 233, 234.

²⁸Cook, III, 235, 236.

the islanders and even Omai was affected, though he tried to justify the captain's actions by saying that in Britain the thief would have been killed. The miscreant himself was far from cowed. A couple of nights later he uprooted plants in the newly formed garden and openly threatened to kill Omai and burn his house when the Europeans had gone. Cook again acted vigorously. He had the man seized and imprisoned on the *Resolution* with the intention, he said, of carrying him elsewhere or, as others alleged, of marooning him on a desert island. But after a few nights on board the indomitable captive managed to free himself from his shackles. The reward offered for his return proving of no avail, he remained at large, a threat to Omai's person and his future.

The carpenters had now completed their work, and the wooden house was ready for occupation. Since they could be securely stored, the remnants of Omai's treasures were transferred from the ship under the eyes of a wondering audience. Among "many other useless things," to quote Cook's dismissive phrase, were an electrical machine, a hand organ, fireworks, and, most admired of all, a box of toys. In contrast, hardly anyone so much as looked at the pots, kettles, dishes, mugs, and so forth brought from England to "civilize" the Pacific. Indeed, observed the captain, Omai began to think likewise: "that a plantain leaf made as good a dish or plate as pewter and that a Cocoonut shell was as good to drink out of as a blackjack." So, to augment his depleted fortune, he exchanged kitchen-ware for hatchets or iron tools. Not all his possessions were so innocuous. His armory included a musket, a fowling-piece, a couple of pistols, two or three swords, and cutlasses. Then there was a suit of armor and a helmet, supplemented in some accounts by a coat of mail. To these were now added cartridges, balls for muskets and pistols, and some twenty pounds of gunpowder. Cook did not impose a ban on weapons, as he had threatened to do in speaking with Boswell; but he did express some uneasiness. The supply of gunpowder, he said, made Omai quite happy and that, he added, was the only reason he left it, "for I was always of Opinion that he would have been better without fire Arms." On the other hand, he could have no doubts about the usefulness of the livestock left on the island. Most precious in native eyes were two horses, male and female, which Cook predicted would be the progenitors of a breed. He also stocked the estate with an assortment of poultry—geese, turkeys, ducks—and as a parting gift presented Omai with a boar and two sows "of the English breed" and a goat big with kid.²⁹

²⁹Cook, III, 237, 239.

In fact, as he summed up his impressions at the end of his stay, Cook felt that the animals were the greatest asset likely to result from Omai's travels. Had the young man not visited England, he reflected, in all probability they would not have come here. As it was, he was confident they would multiply so that in time these islands would equal, if not exceed, "any place in the known World for provisions." He also believed that the trees and plants he had brought would flourish and form "no small acquisition." He had little hope, however, that Omai would be able to introduce many European arts and customs to his people to improve those they already possessed. For he was not a man of much observation and, though endowed with "a tolerable share of understanding," lacked the application and perseverance to exert it. But whatever his fault, Cook acknowledged, they were more than overbalanced by "his great good Nature and docile disposition." Throughout the whole time they had been together he had very seldom had reason to find fault with Omai's conduct. Moreover, his grateful heart always retained "the highest sence of the favours he received in England," nor would he "ever forget those who honoured him with their protection and friendship during his stay there."³⁰

Describing events on the last day at Huahine, 2 November 1777, Cook turned for the only time since their recruitment to Omai's retainers and reported a mild crisis of conscience. "If there had been the most distant probability of any Ship being sent again to New Zealand," he wrote, "I would have brought the two youths of that Country home with me, as they were both desirous of coming." Te Weherua, the elder, he described as "an exceeding well disposed young man with strong natural parts and capable of receiving any instructions." Fully aware of the difference between his own savage homeland and these islands, he "resigned himself very contentedly to end his days upon them." But Koa did not submit as willingly; "the other was so strongly attached to us that he was taken out of the Ship . . . by force." He was "a witty smart boy," Cook added, "and on that account much noticed in the Ship." There was one more parting to record on that final afternoon. When all the other islanders had disembarked, Omai stayed on board until they were at sea. At last he took "a very affectionate farewell of all the Officers," sustaining "himself with a manly resolution till he came to me," wrote Cook, "then his utmost efforts to conceal his tears failed, and . . . he wept all the time in going ashore."³¹

³⁰Cook, III, 240-241

³¹Cook, III, 240-242.

Cook had a little more to say on the subject. A couple of weeks later, while anchored off Ra'iatea, he noted that Omai had sent two of his people with a message: "every thing went well with him, except that his Goat had died in kidding and [he] desired I would send him another and two axes."³² Cook complied and, relieved at last of his importunate charge, set out for the north. In October 1778, on his return from the unsuccessful attempt on the Arctic passage, for the first time since leaving Cape Town he had an opportunity to send letters home. Writing from Unalaska, he briefly reported to the Admiralty that during his voyage in the South Pacific he had given two horses to Omai and left him at Huahine. He summarized more recent activities and announced his intention of wintering in the newly discovered Sandwich Islands. There, on 14 February 1779, he was killed in an affray with the Hawaiians. Omai seems to have survived his patron for only about a year. As far as somewhat confused accounts indicate, both he and the New Zealand boys died of sickness some thirty months after the expedition left Huahine.

DR. ERIC H. McCORMICK, biographer, historian, literary and art critic, is presently Senior Research Fellow in Arts at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, a position held since 1973. Among many of his publications include *Letters and Arts in New Zealand* (1940), *Works of Frances Hodgkins in New Zealand* (1954), the *Expatriate* (1954), for which he received the Hubert Church Award, *Tasman and New Zealando* (1959), *New Zealand Literature* (1959), *Fascinating Folly* (1961), and more recently his *Omai, Pacific Envoy*, printed by the Auckland University Press, 1977.

³²Cook, III, 244-245.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF COOK'S THIRD VOYAGE TO RUSSIAN TENURE IN THE NORTH PACIFIC

by James R. Gibson

Captain James Cook's voyages to the Pacific between 1768 and 1780, thanks to his own great abilities and to strong private and state support, accomplished the monumental feat of accurately surveying, mapping, and publicizing the basic geography of the world's largest ocean. His first and second voyages clarified the outlines of the South Pacific, especially the configuration of the South Sea Islands, New Zealand in particular, and the nonexistence of *Terra Australis Incognita*, the mythical southern continent. His third voyage probed the North Pacific as well, discovering the Hawaiian Islands and delineating the western coast of North America but finding no waterway into the interior and no Northwest or Northeast Passage. Here in the far North Pacific, however, Cook did find fellow European imperialists from Russia who had entered the Pacific from the north and by land. This encounter with the eastbound Russians had several consequences of little importance for the geography but of much significance to the history of the region. These consequences relate to the priority, basis, and stability of Russian tenure between Asia and America and the fate of Russian eastward expansion.

At the end of April 1778, the decrepit *Resolution* and the small *Discovery*, following a month's layover, left King George's or Nootka Sound and sailed northwestward up the coast in accordance with Cook's instructions, which directed him to proceed as far north as 65°. He did not dally, as his expedition was already a year behind schedule. The ships quickly encountered cloudy, rainy weather but occasionally the Northwest Coast was visible—"An uneven mountainous Country; the Hills covered with Snow. The Lower parts Woody . . . many deep Bays," in the eyes of James Burney, first lieutenant on the *Discovery*.¹ Along the fiorded coast the two ships saw no sign of the fifteen Russian crewmen who were reputed to have been lost by Chirikov in 1741, when he and Bering sighted the American mainland, and whose fate was to intrigue and distract navigators for nearly a century.² The vessels

¹James Burney, "Journal of the proceedings of his Majys. Sloop, the *Discovery* . . .," University of British Columbia Library, typescript, II, p. 42.

²See Ya. M. Svet and S. G. Fyodorova, "Istoriya pyatnadsati" ["A History of the Fifteen"], pp. 48-64 of V. Stetsenko, comp., *brigantina* (Moscow, 1971).

approached the Alexander Archipelago off the Alaska Panhandle, where Cook named the volcanic cone of Mount Edgecumbe. Then the Gulf of Alaska was reached, and Prince William Sound and Cook Inlet on either side of the Kenai Peninsula were entered. In Cook Inlet the expedition was "...in hopes of finding a passage into the northern seas, without going any farther to the westward."³ But rather than opening up and leading to the North Atlantic, both channels soon closed in to dead ends, and the ships turned back. So Cook Inlet, which began as the "Gulf of Good Hope," ended as the "Seduction River."

By now Cook was looking closely for traces of Russian occupancy, for London wanted to know how far east its imperial Muscovite rivals had advanced from Asia. The first signs were found in Cook Inlet at the end of May. There the natives had iron knives and spears and glass beads, probably of Russian origin. But as Cook concluded:

It is probable they may get them from some of their Neighbours with whome the Russians may have a trade, for I will be bold to say that the Russians were never amongst these people, nor carry on any commerce with them, for if they did they would hardly be cloathed in such valuable skins as those of the Sea beaver; the Russians would find some means or other to get them all from them.⁴

The expedition returned to the gulf proper and rounded Kodiak Island, which has commonly been regarded as the site of the first permanent Russian settlement in North America. Its founding did not occur until six years later, however, so Cook saw no Russian residents. Bearing southwestward along the Alaska Peninsula, he became more and more convinced that, in his own words, "...the Continent extended farther to the west than from the Modern Charts we had reason to expect and made a passage into Baffin or Hudson bays far less probable, or at least made it of greater extent."⁵ So the outlook was bleak for the expedition's principal objective—the discovery of an Arctic passage.

Nearing the tip of the Alaska Peninsula, Cook came across—in an unusual fashion—evidence of more direct Russian influence upon the na-

³William Ellis, *An Authentic Narrative of a Voyage Performed by Captain Cook*, 2 vols. (London: Robinson and Sewell, 1782), I, 255–256.

⁴J. C. Beaglehole, ed., *The Journals of Captain James Cook on His Voyages of Discovery*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society, 1955–1967), III, 371.

⁵Beaglehole, III, 368.

tives. Off the Shumagin Islands on June 19th some Aleuts in three or four kayaks hailed the *Discovery* and handed the crew a note. Written in Russian (which, surprisingly, no member of the expedition could read), it turned out to be a receipt for fur tribute paid by the Aleuts. Apparently the Aleuts had taken the Englishmen for Russian tribute collectors and had wanted them to know that they had already rendered their due for 1778. At any rate, the receipt demonstrated Russian suzerainty as far as the Shumagins. William Bayly, astronomer on the *Discovery*, reported that "This seems to be the farthest East that the Russians trade along the Coast of America."⁶

A week later the ships sighted Unalaska Island (Fig. 1), which was christened Providence Island following the lucky escape of the two vessels from rocks and reefs in a thick fog on June 26th. They put in to Samganuda Harbor, which was subsequently renamed English Bay in honor of Cook's visit. Here the Aleut natives displayed much evidence of direct Russian contact. For example, they showed little surprise or curiosity upon seeing Europeans, they bowed politely in the European manner, they were friendly and obsequious, they had very few sea otter pelts, they had been deprived of most weapons, they uttered some Russian words, they wore some European clothes, and they used tobacco. No Russians were to be seen, however. After taking on fresh water, shooting some grouse, and gathering wild peas, water cress, and scurvy grass (arctic cress), the expedition quit its providential haven and headed north for the legendary Strait of Anian and the elusive Northwest and Northeast passages.

The rest of the summer was spent in the Bering Sea and the Arctic Ocean. The season notwithstanding, the ships were eventually turned back by pack ice. As Cook himself put it:

The season was now so very far advanced and the time when the frost is expected to set in so near at hand, that I did not think it consistent with prudence to make any farther attempts to find a passage this year in any direction so little was the prospect of succeeding. My attention was now directed towards finding out some place where we could Wood and Water, and in the considering how I should spend the Winter, so as to make some improvement to Geography and Navigation and at the same time be in a condition to return to the North in further search of a Passage the ensuing summer.⁷

⁶Beaglehole, III, 384n.

⁷Beaglehole, III, 427.



Fig. 1—A view of Unalaska, from a drawing by John Webber (courtesy Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Bushnell Collection, 41-72/507).

Cook decided to winter in the Sandwich Islands, where he had already sojourned the previous winter. En route his two ships stopped again at Unalaska to plug leaks, caulk seams, mend sails, and overhaul rigging. These repairs were particularly pressing after the storms and ice of the waters to the north. In addition, water and ballast were obtained, fish were caught, blubber was melted, berries were picked, livestock were pastured, astronomical observations were made, and a spare anchor was fashioned into various articles to trade for provisions in Hawaii. Cook noted, prophetically, that Unalaska Island was a good site for a settlement in view of the "great plenty of good Water," the "great quantity of berries," and the "plenty of fish."⁸

Now the Russians finally made contact. On October 8 a young Aleut chief named Yarmusk or Perpheela presented to Captains Cook and Clerke fish pasties made from salmon and rye flour and seasoned with salt and pepper. Perpheela indicated that the pies came from some Europeans who lived on the island and who, like the Englishmen, had white skin and owned a ship. The American John Ledyard, a corporal in the marines, volunteered to accompany Perpheela back to the Russian encampment and to take some liquor in return for the pasties. He was given two weeks by Cook to make contact and return. Following an arduous two-day journey of twelve to twenty miles by foot and kayak, Ledyard reached the Russian factory of Egoochshac (Illiuliuk), which the Russians came to call Good Harmony or Captain's Harbor and which is now called Dutch Harbor. His warm reception by the Russians prompted him to pen one of his most widely quoted lines: "Hospitality is a virtue peculiar to man, and the obligation is as great to receive as confer."⁹ Equally cogent and memorable was Ledyard's remark on another Russian proclivity. He wrote: "... they were very fond of the rum, which they drank without any mixture or measure."¹⁰

The young Yankee corporal passed two nights at Egoochshac. The settlement comprised one dwelling for the Russians, some thirty native huts, three storehouses containing furs, anchors, and cables, a bathhouse, and a boathouse, plus a small sloop of about thirty tons burthen.¹¹ The

⁸Beaglehole, III, 393, 448.

⁹James Kenneth Munford, ed., *John Ledyard's Journal of Captain Cook's Last Voyage* (Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University Press, 1963), p. 94.

¹⁰Munford, p. 95.

¹¹Several members of the expedition, however, reported that the sloop was fifty to sixty tons. See Beaglehole, III, 1139, 1334, 1355; and Ellis, II, 35. The captain of the sloop, Peter Natrubin, claimed to have sailed as a boy with Bering in 1741; in fact, he was a henchman of the infamous *Solovoy* (see below page 000).

settlement was described by Thomas Edgar, sailing master on the *Discovery*, who visited Egoochshac a few days after Ledyard in the company of John Webber, the expedition's principal artist:

The ground where the factory is built is a low leavel spot about 2 or 3 miles in an Oval form, a very fine fresh water river running close by the house. The harbour is small & only fit for small vessels, well sheltred from wind or Sea, being surrounded by high hills on all sides. The dwelling house is about 70 or 75 feet long & about 20 or 24 feet broad & about 18 feet high in the middle, being built in an Arch'd form with American timber & well thatch'd with straw and dry'd grass . . . ; the ends are flat boarded up; the House stands East and West, the door on the south side near the west end & a Centinal allways standing at the door with a drawn sword or loaded musquet. The principal people live at the East end of the house; having a window at that end made of tulk [talc] gives a tolerable good light, with a sky light over head & cover'd with the intestines of some of the large sea animals, gives very good light also. The next appartment to this lives some russians & the better sort of Kamscadales, the lower sort of russians & Kamscadales spreading their skins on dry'd grass & sleeping on the ground. They cook all their provisions in large copper kettles in the middle of this house, which makes it very disagreeable sleeping after day break, the house being full of smoake occasiond by their burning dry'd grass & turf, there being no Wood on the Island but what is brought from the continent. . . . here is three large store houses a little distance from this where they keep their dry'd fish, skins, provisions &c in. . . . Here is several Indian houses with familys living amongst them, . . . & they have two crosses opposite each other, painted white, about 10 or 12 feet high bearing east & west dist from each other about a quarter of a mile. The Sloop is hauld up within 10 or 12 yards of the house laying in 2 feet water, she is Lighter built, appears very strong & clumsy. . . . On the shore stands several canoes & one large open skin boat.¹²

The Russian inhabitants were preoccupied with the maritime fur trade. In the words of Captain Clerke, commander of the *Discovery*, "the

¹²Beaglehole, III, 1354-1355.

business of the Russians here is to collect Skins of the Natives about the different Isles, particularly those of the Sea Beaver. . . ."¹³ They did not farm, but they subsisted on fish, blubber, berries, and sarana (the root of the Kamchatka lily). James King, second lieutenant on the *Resolution*, remarked that "... their diet must be poor, which indeed was sufficiently evident from their sallow Complexions & wan looks."¹⁴ The settlement numbered from thirty to sixty Russians, from twenty to seventy Kamchadals, and 300 Aleuts¹⁵ under Gerasim Izmailov,¹⁶ who was the chief spokesman for the Russians and the main informant for the Englishmen. To the southwest on nearby Umnak Island there was another settlement of ninety-seven Russians and a sloop under Yakov Sapozhnikov.¹⁷ Altogether there were from sixty to seventy Russians and as many or more Kamchadals, plus 300 Aleuts, on Unalaska Island and reportedly from 400 to 500 Russians and a "great many" Kamchadals on the entire Aleutian chain.¹⁸

A couple of days after Ledyard's visit, Izmailov called on Cook aboard the *Resolution*. Izmailov related that his men had avoided the Englishmen during their first stopover in June, taking them for Chinese or Japanese, and that initially the Russians did not make an appearance during this their second stopover in the belief they were French or Spanish. Now, however, the Russians were eager to get rum and brandy from their visitors, and the Aleuts tobacco for sniffing and chewing. And the Englishmen were keen to learn the condition of the Bering Sea and the availability of assistance in Kamchatka the following summer for the expedition's next attempt to find the Arctic passage. Cook also wanted to know the nature and extent of Russian discoveries and settlement between Asia and America. He was shown a crude map and told that the Russians had tried several times to establish a settlement on the adjacent continental mainland—the "great land"—but had been thwarted by native resistance. Evidently the Russian traders had settled

¹³Beaglehole, III, 1338.

¹⁴Beaglehole, III, 1453.

¹⁵Burney, III, 31; F. W. Howay, ed., *Zimmerman's Captain Cook* (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1930), p. 82; Munford, p. 98; John Rickman, *Journal of Captain Cook's Last Voyage to the Pacific Ocean* (London: E. Newberry, 1781), p. 298.

¹⁶Izmailov claimed to have been a member of Lieutenant Sindt's voyage of 1764 to the Bering Sea.

¹⁷Beaglehole, III, 1449.

¹⁸Beaglehole, III, 1141, 1338, 1449; Burney, III, 31; Ellis, II, 35–36; Munford, p. 98.

no farther east than Unalaska. As Cook reported, "It appeared by the Chart as well as by the testimony of Ismyloff and the others that this is as far as the Russians have discovered and extended themselves sence Behring's time. . . ." ¹⁹ "They all affirmed," he added, "that no persons of that nation had settled themselves so far to the eastward, as the place where the natives gave the note to Captain Clerke. . . ." ²⁰ So Kodiak Island had not yet been settled. Moreover, the Unalaska settlement was clearly a permanent one. Although, as Cook admitted, "We neglected to inquire how long they have had a settlement upon Oonashka . . .," ²¹ several members of the expedition noted that the Russians had already resided on the island for a year or two and would stay for another couple of years. Cook himself, for example, stated that "All these Furriers are releived from time to time by others, those we met with came here from *Okhotsk* in 1776 and are to return in 1781, so that there stay at the island will be four years at least." ²² Edgar asserted that "These people came here in 1777 & are to return to Kamscatka in 1780, at which time are to be releiv'd by others." ²³ Some of the Russians told Clerke and William Ellis, surgeon's mate on the *Discovery*, that they would return to Okhotsk in 1780, ²⁴ and King recorded that ". . . these people stay out five or eight years. . . ." ²⁵ King also mentioned that Izmailov had said that he had left Okhotsk in 1776 and would return in 1781. ²⁶ Finally, Ledyard reported that the Russians and Kamchadals had come to Unalaska from Kamchatka in the small sloop ". . . in order to establish a pelt and fur factory." ²⁷ They had been there, he added, about five years, and every year the sloop delivered furs to Kamchatka (a two-month voyage, according to second lieutenant John

¹⁹Beaglehole, III, 455.

²⁰Captain James Cook and Captain James King, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean*, 4 vols. (London: John Stockdale, 1784), III, 100. One member of the expedition, however—James Burney—asserted that "They have one settlement to the east of the island Oonashka, near the high mountains." See Burney, IV, 19. He apparently obtained this information in Kamchatka.

²¹Cook and King, p. 104.

²²Beaglehole, III, 458.

²³Beaglehole, III, 1355.

²⁴Beaglehole, III, 1339; Ellis, II, 35.

²⁵Beaglehole, III, 1447.

²⁶Beaglehole, III, 1449.

²⁷Munford, p. 100.

Rickman of the *Discovery*) and returned with supplies.²⁸ Thus Egochshac had been founded as a permanent base on the site of the Aleut village of Illiuliuk in the early 1770s. According to the Russian Orthodox missionary Ivan Veniaminov in his classic account of the Unalaska district, "It is said that this settlement was founded by Solovyov."²⁹ Ivan Solovyov³⁰ captained the vessel *St. Paul* during its five-year trading voyage of 1770–1775 to the Aleutians. He reached Captain's Harbor³¹ in the summer of 1772 and remained until the spring of 1775. Here he established a camp of huts, dugouts, forge, and the like, which were "preserved," i.e., not abandoned, at his departure.³² Only forty-one of Solovyov's original crew of seventy-one returned to Okhotsk with him.³³ Many of the rest had been killed by natives, but some may have stayed behind to man the new post; if not, the base was reoccupied in 1776, again by the *St. Paul*, now under the command of Izmailov, who returned to Okhotsk in 1781,³⁴ just as Cook and King stated.³⁵ The Unalak settlement was probably founded a year or two after Egochshac by Sapozhnikov, who skippered the *St. Euflus* during its voyage of 1773–1779 to the Aleutians.

²⁸A decade later Ledyard, an eager traveller, tried to travel from Siberia to Alaska with the aim of crossing the North American continent from west to east, but at the instigation of Grigory Shelikhov, a leading fur trader, he was stopped at Yakutsk and deported westwards by imperial order in the belief that he was a British agent intent on spying on Russian activity in the far North Pacific. See Stephen D. Watrous, ed., *John Ledyard's Journey Through Russia and Siberia, 1781–1788* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966).

²⁹Ivan Veniaminov, *Zapiski ob ostrovakh Unalashkinskavo otdela* [Notes on the Islands of the Unalaska District] (St. Petersburg: Rossiisko-Amerikanskaya Kompaniya, 1840), pt. 2, p. 173.

³⁰This was the same Solovyov who became notorious for killing Aleuts on a genocidal scale in the middle 1760s during his first voyage to the Aleutians.

³¹Named after Captain Mikhail Levashov who wintered there in 1769.

³²N. N. Ogloblin, "Puteviya zapiski morekhoda I. M. Solovyova 1770–1775 gg." ["The Travel Notes of the Seafarer I. M. Solovyova, 1770–1775"], *Russkaya starina*, 76 (1892), 213.

³³Solovyov returned with seven Aleuts and 4,886 fox and 1,900 sea otter pelts worth 150,000 rubles at Okhotsk.

³⁴Vasilii Nikolaevich Berkh, *A Chronological History of the Discovery of the Aleutian Islands*, trans. Dimitri Krenov and ed. Richard A. Pierce (Kingston, Ontario: Limestone Press, 1974), p. 56.

³⁵He may have been relieved by the *St. Alexander Nevsky*, which was sent from Okhotsk in 1781 by the "luckiest of all the Siberian Argonauts," the merchants Lapin, Orekhov, and Shilov, who also owned the *St. Paul*. See Berkh, pp. 56, 60.



Fig. 2—A view of Petropavlovsk, from a watercolor painting by John Webber (courtesy State Library of New South Wales, Mitchell Library, ML ZDL PXX2 f41).

Thus, as the Soviet ethnographer Fyodorova has hypothesized,³⁶ on the basis of the several journals kept by members of Cook's last voyage (some of them published only recently) it can be concluded that in all likelihood the first permanent Russian settlement in North America was founded at Illiuliuk in 1772 or 1773. This predates by more than a decade the establishment by Grigory Shelikhov in 1784 on Kodiak Island of Three Saints Harbor, which has heretofore commonly been considered the first permanent Russian settlement in America. A year-round base entailed less voyaging from Siberia's ports and more trading on the Aleutians, so that profits were increased and control was tightened. Russian tenure, then, was probably stabilized during the third rather than the fourth quarter of the eighteenth century.

On October 26, having received letters of introduction from Izmailov to the authorities of Kamchatka, Cook's expedition quit Unalaska and stood for the Hawaiian Islands to winter. There, of course, the deified but ailing Cook was killed at Kealahakua Bay in mid-February of 1779 by aggrieved islanders. A month later, after considerable killing, burning, and looting, the Englishmen, now commanded by the consumptive Clerke, left for Kamchatka. This "wretched Country," as it was termed by one of the squadron's members, was to be used as a springboard for a final try at the Northwest or Northeast Passage. Cook himself had had "so bad an opinion" of the peninsula that "he was sure nothing could be got," according to King.³⁷ But it would have to suffice, as there was no other accessible and suitable base within striking distance of Bering Strait.

Kamchatka was reached at the beginning of May. The *Resolution* and *Discovery* anchored in Avacha Bay, which was acknowledged by the crews as a superb natural harbor, although it was still half-covered with ice and the snowbound vicinity had a dreary aspect. The expedition spent six weeks here wooding and watering, victualing and visiting before sailing north.³⁸ The two ships got as far as 69°N. before being halted by ice, and the *Discovery* was badly damaged. Neither a Northwest nor a Northeast Passage was discovered. As Burney put it,

³⁶Svetlana G. Fyodorova, "Pervoye postoyannoye poselenie russkikh v Amerike i Dzh. Kuk" ["The First Permanent Russian Settlement in America and J. Cook"], pp. 228-236 of Kim V. Malakhovsky, ed., *Novoye v izuchenii Avstralii i Okeanii* (Moscow: Hayka, 1972.)

³⁷Beaglehole, III, 650.

³⁸The *Resolution* alone took on fifty-five tons of fresh water. See Cook and King, IV, 6.

"... finding our run to the northward as well as our approaches to either continent obstructed by the sea being so full of ice, it was judged fruitless to make any more attempts."³⁹ They returned to Kamchatka for repairs,⁴⁰ supplies, and ballast in late August, just after Clerke had died and Gore had succeeded to the command. Another six weeks were passed in Avacha Bay; this time the peninsula was much more attractive in its verdant phase. Clerke was buried ashore, and in early October the expedition headed home via the Cape.

When the *Resolution* and *Discovery* called at Petropavlovsk for the first time in the spring, their crews were surprised and perplexed by the apprehension and suspicion displayed by the Russians. King and Webber were received ashore by "15 Russians under Arms" who were "much alarmed."⁴¹ In a few days two envoys arrived from the governor, Major Behm, who resided at Bolsheretsk on the western side of the peninsula.⁴² King noted that "They shew'd great surprise & even fear on our [*sic*: their] first coming on board, not expecting to see two ships so much larger than their own Sloops in this part of the World." "... they were frightn'd," he added, "& desired two of the boats crew to be left on shore as hostages for their safety."⁴³ The envoys also admitted that on the previous day during a visit by King to Sergeant Surgutsky, commandant of Petropavlovsk, they had been concealed in Surgutsky's kitchen to overhear the conversation and verify King's English nationality! Finally, they said that when Governor Behm at Bolsheretsk heard of the expedition's arrival, "It requir'd ... the Majors authority to keep the inhabitants from leaving the Town."⁴⁴ Before the envoys had left Bolsheretsk a council of war had decided not to forcibly oppose the visitors but only because soldiers and guns were insufficient.⁴⁵

³⁹Burney, IV, 30.

⁴⁰According to the quartermaster of the *Discovery*, Alexander Home, the *Resolution* "... was in so Rottin and crazy a condition that there was great reason to fear she would never go Home." Alexander Home, "An Account of Kamschatska," National Library of Australia, MS 690, p. 30.

⁴¹Beaglehole, III, 646, 1239.

⁴²Until 1785, Bolsheretsk was the administrative center of Kamchatka.

⁴³Beaglehole, III, 653.

⁴⁴Beaglehole, III, 654.

⁴⁵[S. N. Sch.], "The English in Kamchatka, 1779," trans. Eleanor Lieven, *Geographical Journal*, 84 (1934), 417.

This reaction was motivated by more than just plain surprise⁴⁶ or traditional Russian xenophobia. In advancing across Siberia from the late 1500s, Muscovy had met little resistance, either internally or externally. Siberia's natives were not numerous or united, and they lacked firearms. And no foreign powers challenged the Russian conquest. The two that could have done so—China and Japan—refrained because of isolationist policies imposed by regimes that came to power just as Russia was penetrating Siberia—the Manchu (Ching) Dynasty in 1644 and the Tokugawa Shogunate in 1603. So Russia had a free hand east of the Urals, and her eastward advance was not seriously challenged until the beginning of the nineteenth century on the Northwest Coast. Consequently, Russia's forces in Siberia did not have to be large, and the appearance of any foreign force was both a rarity and a threat. Particularly was this the case with Kamchatka, whose peripheral location, maritime disposition, and outward thrust rendered it more exposed than most other parts of Siberia. Being more remote from European Russia, the peninsula was more difficult to man and supply and hence to defend. According to various members of the expedition, there were only from 400 to 500 soldiers and Cossacks in Kamchatka, including from thirty to forty at Petropavlovsk, and most of them were "transports" (exiles).⁴⁷ Petropavlovsk, Russia's second most important port on the Pacific after Okhotsk, had been described by Unalaska's Izmailov as a large town with forty guns, but it turned out to be "... a poor forlorn hamlet, containing only twenty-one wooden buildings ... and ... two guns ...," according to Ellis (Fig. 2).⁴⁸ This military presence was not only undermanned and underequipped but also undertrained, underpaid, and underfed, as Governor Shamlev, Behm's successor, informed the governor of Irkutsk Province (which included Kamchatka):

Though I am ordered, in case of an arrival of foreigners in Kamchatka, not to allow more than ten people to land and this only for most urgent reasons, I see no possibility of executing this command, because all the guns of the Cossacks are in disorder. Only those are sent to Kamchatka from Jakutsk and Ochotsk which are not suitable for use there. There is neither a good artillery nor gunners. All the guns we have here will

⁴⁶For example, Home noted that "... the Russians were greatly alarmed and it was no wonder for such an Event was as little lookt for as that of the Moons falling to Earth." See Home, p. 30.

⁴⁷Beaglehole, III, 1258; Burney, IV, 13; Cook and King, IV, 152; Ellis, II, 241.

⁴⁸Ellis, II, 205.

sooner damage our gunners than the enemy, and the artillerymen do not know their business at all, so that the salutes on solemn days are often accompanied by disasters. At the departure of the English from Bolsherezh the gunner who was loading the cannon was killed.

In the whole of Kamchatka . . . there are . . . in all garrisons 398 men. Every spring very many of these sicken, in consequence of catching the scurvy; only one part of the so-called healthy people possess ammunition; the greater part is dressed in dogs' and stags' skins in the local manner, and therefore have not even the appearance of a soldier. As no uniforms are delivered to them, they are not punished for their unsoldierly appearance. Their pay is 4 roubles 28 kopecks a quarter; in the form of provision however they get 32½ pounds of flour and groats monthly. On that account the fixed pay is extremely small not only for a livelihood, but also for buying food; therefore they are allowed, in order to save them from exhaustion by hunger, to catch fish in summer and to salt them for the winter. Thus, if they would be taken away from that work to build fortifications and make preparations for defense from inimical and foreign people, as well in Bolsherezh as in the harbour of Petropavlovsk, they would die of starvation.⁴⁹

Hence Captain King's comment that "From these circumstances, it is pretty apparent that the Russian commanders in Siberia, had, from our visiting this place, been induced to attend to the defenceless situation of it; and the honest Serjeant [Surgutsky] shrewdly observed, that, as we had found the way thither, others might do the same, who might not be so welcome as ourselves."⁵⁰

Furthermore, as Shmalev indicated, many of the Russians were disabled by scurvy. The English seamen, by contrast, were healthy and fit, thanks to Cook's radical insistence upon fresh food and water, clean and airy quarters, clean and warm bedding and clothing, scrupulous personal hygiene, regular exercise, and ample rest. Indeed, not once did scurvy appear on either ship throughout the voyage,⁵¹ although venereal disease was prevalent. Among the Russians on Kamchatka scurvy was endemic. Ellis observed that "Most of the Russians were most terribly

⁴⁹[Sch.], "English in Kamchatka," p. 418.

⁵⁰Cook and King, IV, 80.

⁵¹Howay, p. 101.

afflicted with the scurvy; and one man had been ill near four years. . . .”⁵² “... Many of the Russian souldiers die of it,” asserted David Samwell, surgeon on the *Discovery*.⁵³ His counterpart on the *Resolution*, John Law, visited Petropavlovsk daily to treat the scorbutic residents. The Englishmen regularly collected nettles, wild celery, wild garlic, and even birch sap as antiscorbutics, but the Russians, according to Home, “... were too lazy to gather the green stuff with which the country abounded.”⁵⁴ He added disdainfully:

When they saw us Taping the Birch Trees they told us that the Juice of the Birch was exceeding good. But they never offered to do it themselves, and at the same time their Hospital was full of scorbutic people . . . and scarcely a Russian, soldier or sailor But what was more or less afflicted with it. They expressed great surprize at our eating of nettles, and it was plain it was a thought that never had struck them. It was our custom whilst here to strew out soup . . . thick with nettles and cellary, and besides this to eat great quantitys of Boiled nettles . . . and along with our Meal to drink the Juice of the Birch . . . and Leeks was always eatt raw . . . and also Boiled amongst the Broth. But they did not think fit to be Taught by us in such matters. . . .⁵⁵

No wonder that King remarked that “... the difference in the appearance of our people & the Russian Soldiers is very striking.”⁵⁶ This sentiment was echoed by Governor Behm. Samwell wrote:

The Major often expressed his Surprize that all our people should look so well after having been out near three Years, and said that from our Appearance he should have supposed that we had but just left England, nor was he less astonished to hear that we had lost but such a small Number of Men by sickness, telling us that the Russians send their small Sloops with about 60 Men in them on a Summer’s Cruise to the Coast of America and the adjacent Isles & that it often happens that not more than 20 or 30 of them return home alive, the rest dying of the

⁵²Ellis, II, 216.

⁵³Beaglehole, III, 1242.

⁵⁴Beaglehole, III, 659n.

⁵⁵Home, p. 17.

⁵⁶Beaglehole, III, 670.

Scurvy & other Disorders; & he was somewhat amazed to find that we carried only 112 Men in the Resolution & but 70 in the Discovery, for the Russian Sloops of one Mast and abt 70 ton Burden generally carried sixty Hands.⁵⁷

Another concern also made the Russians anxious. Between Kamchatka and Alaska they had opened the lucrative sea otter trade, which they jealously guarded. This enterprise had been successfully monopolized by the Russians ever since it had been serendipitously initiated in the early 1740s by Bering's second expedition. The pelts brought high prices in China, and the Russians did not want to see these prices lowered and their catches reduced by competition from Englishmen or anyone else, especially if the competitors were to gain access to the ports of South China. These ports were closed to Russian traders, who had to bear the heavier expense of getting their furs to Kyakhta on the Mongolian frontier, where they were permitted to make transactions. A prime sea otter skin was worth thirty to forty-five rubles (six to nine pounds sterling) in Kamchatka but brought twice as much at Kyakhta and thrice as much at Peking.⁵⁸ "Such is the jealousy the Russians entertain of the trade to the north, which they now look upon as we did formerly upon the trade to America, as of right belonging to them;—founding their claim on their priority of discovery . . .," commented Rickman.⁵⁹

Finally, Izmailov in his letters of introduction, one of which was delivered to Governor Behm, had, in Samwell's words, "... represented us as Traders and Hollanders or for what he knew Pirates, and advised his Countrymen at Kamtschatka to be upon their Guard against us . . ." ⁶⁰ He also misrepresented the English ships as packet boats. This apparent paranoia on Izmailov's part stemmed from a more specific circumstance that had made the peninsula's Russian inhabitants inordinately wary. Only eight years earlier a Hungarian exile named Baron Benyowsky had fomented an insurrection at Bolsheretsk. Several Russians, including the governor, were duped and killed. Several others, including Izmailov, were taken hostage by Benyowsky and forced to sail him to Canton, whence they returned to Europe on French ships.⁶¹ This incident under-

⁵⁷Beaglehole, III, 1247.

⁵⁸Burney, IV, 19; Cook and King, IV, 156; Ellis, II, 215; Home, p. 26.

⁵⁹Rickman, p. 343.

⁶⁰Beaglehole, III, 1242.

⁶¹See Captain Pasfield Oliver, ed., *The Memoirs and Travels of Mauritius Augustus Count de Benyowsky* (London: Adventure Series, 1893).

lined the weakness of Russian forces in Kamchatka and unnerved the Russian residents. It was still fresh in their memories at the time of the arrival of Cook's expedition, which some locals took to be a punitive force under Benyowsky.

Despite this weakness and fear, the peninsula's authorities, particularly Governor Behm, outdid themselves in accommodating their English visitors. Notwithstanding the peninsula's meagre resources,⁶² Behm and his successor, Captain Shmalev, combed the countryside to meet the expedition's needs. Altogether thirty-nine head of cattle,⁶³ nearly 30,000 pounds of rye flour, 400 pounds of tobacco,⁶⁴ 100 pounds of sugar, and 20 pounds of tea, plus milk, butter, eggs, honey, ducks, venison, turnips, tar, rope, and canvas were provided.⁶⁵ Behm also privately presented gifts worth at least £200.⁶⁶ In addition, the Kamchadals supplied more fish than the two ships could use. The fresh beef and fresh bread were especially welcome, for the crews had not received any fresh beef or a full ration of bread (one pound per man per day) for two-and-a-half years.⁶⁷ Although these supplies were very expensive at the local prices of eight to ten rubles per pood (thirty-six pounds) of flour and 100 rubles per head of cattle⁶⁸—twice as expensive as Sapozhnikov on Unalaska had said they would be—Behm would accept no payment for them.⁶⁹ The Englishmen were as overwhelmed by this gen-

⁶²For example, Home observed that "It is but seldom things can be got so that every where there is great poverty . . ." Home, p. 16, and Burney noted that "... Russians of St. Peter and Paul were as much in need of assistance as able to supply our wants . . ." Burney, IV, 14.

⁶³There were no more than thirty cattle at the peninsular capital of Bolsheretsk. Cook and King, III, 338.

⁶⁴This amount was enough for three pounds for each user in the expedition. Burney, IV, 15.

⁶⁵Beaglehole, III, 657-659, 668, 674n, 675-676, 707, 1260, 1280; Cook and King, III, 338, IV, 4, 6-7, 70, 80-81; Ellis, II, 221, 231, 298-299, 302; Howay, pp. 105, 107; Munford, p. 167; Rickman, pp. 345-347.

⁶⁶Cook and King, III, 399.

⁶⁷Burney, IV, 16; Cook and King, IV, 4, 6.

⁶⁸Beaglehole, III, 647. Manufactures cost three times as much as in England. Cook and King, IV, 155.

⁶⁹Altogether the Russians provided supplies worth 2,257 rubles at state prices but probably more than 8,000 rubles at market prices. See J. C. Beaglehole, ed., *Cook and the Russians* (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1973), pp. 6-8, 7n. Also see Ya. M. Svet, trans., *Tret'e plavanie kapitana Dzhemsa Kuka* [The Third Voyage of Captain James Cook] (Moscow: Izdatelstvo "Mysl," 1971), pp. 574-575.

erosity as the Russians were by the expedition's exploits. "Nothing can exceed the attention and friendship of this Worthy Governor," wrote Clerke. He added: "Our wants were no sooner hinted than a supply was order'd with every expedition that could be thought of, in short it appear'd their warmest wish and utmost ambition to contribute to our convenience and satisfaction."⁷⁰ Henry Roberts, master's mate on the *Resolution*, acknowledged Behm's "extraordinary civility's & unbounded generosity."⁷¹ King was more eloquent in his gratitude:

In this wretched extremity of the earth, beyond conception barbarous and inhospitable, out of the reach of civilization, bound and barricadoed with ice, and covered with summer snow, we experienced the tenderest feelings of humanity, joined to a nobleness of mind, and elevation of sentiment, which would have done honour to any clime or nation.⁷²

The guests expressed their appreciation by giving Behm 100 gallons of brandy—no mean present in the eyes of the bibulous seamen—some curiosities, guns, and a gold watch.⁷³ The brandy must have been particularly appreciated, for the reason established earlier by Ledyard and now corroborated by Home: "Brandy is lookt upon as the very Elixir of Life. When a Bottle is produced they cannot conceal their Joy, and when once they have got a little . . . they will give any price for more."⁷⁴ Some of the expedition's papers were also entrusted to Behm for delivery to the English ambassador in St. Petersburg upon the governor's imminent return to European Russia.

The question arises—at the risk of cynicism—as to why the Russians were so generous with scarce and costly supplies. It is true that Governor Behm had received orders from his empress to assist the Englishmen, but he need not have been so liberal. Probably traditional Russian hospitality was partially responsible, as was a genuine desire to help fellow European Christians in their scientific endeavors. But the Russians may also have been motivated by a desire to impress their visitors into believing that Kamchatka (and by implication all of the Russian

⁷⁰Beaglehole, III, 658.

⁷¹Beaglehole, III, 673n.

⁷²Cook and King, III, 353–354.

⁷³Rickman, p. 347.

⁷⁴Home, p. 25.

Far East) was more bountiful and hence more formidable than it actually was. In other words, the magnanimity may have been in part at least a deliberate deceit designed to conceal the region's vulnerability from potential rivals, particularly those who might find a convenient passage from the North Atlantic to the North Pacific.⁷⁵ Be that as it may, in an attempt to lessen this vulnerability a Russian galiot, the *St. George*, arrived at Petropavlovsk from Okhotsk a month before the expedition's departure with supplies and soldiers, including an officer and fifty men "...to reinforce this & some of the Neighbouring places"⁷⁶ and "2 great Guns for the Garrison."⁷⁷ At the end of the year St. Petersburg acknowledged Kamchatka's "deficiencies" and ordered the governor of Irkutsk Province "...to provide, according to need and possibility, security from powerful hostile action..." against the peninsula.⁷⁸ So in 1780, together with a new governor, four cannoneers, fifty rifles "fit for use," 1,800 pounds of lead, and 180 pounds of gunpowder were sent to Kamchatka.⁷⁹ In 1784, Grigory Shelikhov, with much state assistance, founded Three Saints Harbor on Kodiak Island, thereby giving Russia a commanding position in the Gulf of Alaska. A year later the elaborate North Eastern Expedition under Joseph Billings was launched to, among other things, show the flag in the very far North Pacific waters so recently tracked by Cook. In 1787 Jean De Lesseps, the only survivor of Lapérouse's voyage (1785-1788), learned at Petropavlovsk of a plan to strengthen its garrison and fortifications.⁸⁰ In the same year Catherine II ordered the dispatch of four warships from Cronstadt to the North Pacific to protect Russian interests there. Although these vessels were not sent, owing to the outbreak of war with Turkey and Swe-

⁷⁵If such were the case, the ruse did not work. Seven years later, in 1786, Captain Peters of the British East India Company arrived at Petropavlovsk with a proposal to trade supplies for furs. Britain did not try to take advantage of Russia's military weakness in the region until the Crimean War, when an Anglo-French squadron attacked Petropavlovsk (and was ignominiously repulsed). See John J. Stephan, "The Crimean War in the Far East," *Modern Asian Studies* III, Pt. 3 (July 1969), 257-277.

⁷⁶Beaglehole, III, 705.

⁷⁷The *St. George* took thirty-five days to sail the 1,000 miles from Okhotsk. Cook and King, IV, 79-80. Beaglehole, III, 705.

⁷⁸Beaglehole, *Cook and the Russians*, p. 9.

⁷⁹[Sch.], "English in Kamchatka," p. 419.

⁸⁰Jean B. de Lesseps, *Travels in Kamtschatka* (New York: Arno Press, 1970), I, 8-9, 13-14. Ironically, Cook's expedition also served to strengthen Russia's presence in north-eastern Asia, for his landing on the Chukchi Peninsula in the summer of 1778 prompted some recalcitrant Chukchi to voluntarily submit to Russian tribute.

den, the Siberian Flotilla, based at Okhotsk, was bolstered—from five vessels in 1786 to ten in 1804.⁸¹ Similarly, the populations of Okhotsk and Petropavlovsk more or less doubled by the end of the century.⁸² Finally, in 1798 the Kamchatka Regiment of 300 men under Major Somov was stationed on Kamchatka and along the Okhotsk Seaboard.⁸³ Russia's far eastern flank was thereby considerably strengthened.

On 10 October 1779 the *Resolution* and *Discovery* set sail from Kamchatka and stood south. The consensus of opinion among the officers was that a course "...going to the Eastward of Japan and touching for refreshments at Macao in China would be the most eligible Plan for us to pursue in making our Passage home."⁸⁴ At the end of November the two vessels dropped anchor for six weeks in Macao Roads at the mouth of the Canton River. Here, in the words of George Gilbert, midshipman on the *Discovery*, "The Chinese suppl[i]ed us very plentifully with provisions of all kinds but at a very dear rate...."⁸⁵ Also obtained was news of the outbreak of war between England and France and of the progress of the American Revolution. More importantly, the Englishmen sold the remainder of their furs for fabulous prices, particularly the sea otter pelts. Only now did the ships' companies realize that they had been outbargained in Kamchatka, where "most" of their furs had been sold to Russian merchants for what had then been considered a "great price," or, in King's words, a "larger Price ... than was expect'd."⁸⁶ The merchant Vasily Feodosich had paid four to six pounds sterling (twenty to thirty rubles) for good sea otter skins and £60 for the best pelt.⁸⁷ But this was only half as much as the Chinese paid.⁸⁸ Twenty pelts which belonged to the commanders were sold at Canton for \$800, or \$40 each.⁸⁹ Gilbert was ecstatic; "...the Chinese being

⁸¹James R. Gibson, *Feeding the Russian Fur Trade* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), p. 103.

⁸²Gibson, pp. 19–21.

⁸³Gibson, p. 90n.

⁸⁴Beaglehole, III, 1281.

⁸⁵Beaglehole, III, 713.

⁸⁶Beaglehole, III, 660.

⁸⁷Beaglehole, III, 1243.

⁸⁸Moreover, at Petropavlovsk some of the English sailors had sold their sea otter skins for rubles, but as there was little to be bought with them, they were kicked about the deck in frustration.

⁸⁹Cook and King, IV, 236–238.

very Eager to purchase . . . gave us from 50 to 70 dollars a skin; that is from 11⁴/₅^s to 15⁴/₅^s for what we bought with only a hatchet or a Saw.”⁹⁰ The rest of the men were equally excited, being convinced that their fortunes could easily be made in the maritime fur trade. King described the situation:

During the absence of our party from Macao, a brisk traffic had been carrying on with the Chinese for our sea-otter skins, the value of which had augmented every day. One of our sailors disposed of his stock, alone, for eight hundred dollars; and a few of the best skins, which were clean, and had been carefully preserved, produced a hundred and twenty dollars each. The total amount of the value, in goods and cash, that was obtained for the furs of both our vessels, we are confident was not less than two thousands pounds sterling; and it was the general opinion, that at least two-thirds of the quantity we had originally procured from the Americans, were by this time spoiled and worn out, or had been bestowed as presents, and otherwise disposed of, in Kamtschatka. If, in addition to these facts, we consider, that we at first collected the furs without having just ideas of their real value; that most of them had been worn by the savages from whom we purchased them; that little regard was afterwards shewn to their preservation; that they were frequently made use of as bed-clothes, and likewise for other purposes, during our cruize to the northward; and that, in all probability, we never realized the full value for them in China; the benefits that might accrue from a voyage to that part of the American coast where we obtained them, undertaken with commercial views, will certainly appear of sufficient importance to claim the public attention.

So great was the rage with which our seamen were possessed to return to Cook's River [Inlet], and there procure another cargo of skins, by which they might be enabled to make their fortunes, that, at one time, they were almost on the point of proceeding to a mutiny.⁹¹

King suggested that the British East India Company send two ships from Canton with iron, woolen cloth, glass and copper trinkets, and knives to the Northwest Coast in the early spring to trade until the

⁹⁰Beaglehole, III, 714.

⁹¹Cook and King, IV, 245-246.



Fig. 3—A freshly killed young sea otter of Nootka Sound, from a watercolor painting by John Webber (courtesy National Library of Australia, Rex Van Kivell Collection, NK 52A).

early fall; they would, he asserted, return with 250 sea otter pelts worth \$100 each or a total of \$25,000, as against a cost of \$6,000.⁹²

The object of this excitement was a playful marine mammal with a lustrous coat—the sea otter or “sea beaver” (Fig. 3). Its pelt was first encountered by Cook at Nootka Sound. His two ships stopped there at the end of March 1778 for “watering” and “wooding,” i.e., to get fresh water and make new masts.⁹³ No sooner had they anchored than they were surrounded by the canoes of Indians who were eager to trade.⁹⁴ Around the sound there were five Indian villages, each containing 500 to 2,000 inhabitants,⁹⁵ and additional Indians came from distant points to trade. At times, as many as 500 natives in more than 100 canoes hovered around the two ships.⁹⁶ The Nootkas proved to be astute entrepreneurs. They prevented neighboring tribes from trading with the Englishmen in order to safeguard their profitable role as commercial middlemen, and, in Cook’s own words, they “. . . possessed such strict notions of their having an exclusive property in the produce of their country . . .” that “They even wanted our people to pay for the wood and water that were carried on board,” as well as the grass.⁹⁷ According to Burney, “. . . Iron, Brass and Copper were the articles on which the Indians set the greatest Value.”⁹⁸ Cook described the scene:

A great many Canoes filled with the Natives were about the Ships all day, and a trade commenced betwixt us and them, which was carried on with the Strictest honesty on both sides. Their articles were the Skins of various animals, such as Bears, Wolves, Foxes, Deer, Rackoons, Polecats, Martins and in particular the Sea Beaver, the same as is found on the coast of

⁹²Cook and King, IV, 246-250.

⁹³In addition, the sound was reconnoitered, astronomical observations were made, natural specimens were collected, bearings were taken, livestock were pastured, grass was cut, fish were caught, animals were hunted, and spruce beer was made (by boiling coniferous boughs in water and adding malt liquor and sugar).

⁹⁴No wonder that Nootka Sound subsequently became a major rendezvous for ships engaged in the maritime fur trade. Apart from a spacious and sheltered harbor and trading natives, Ledyard noted that “. . . as it afforded excellent timber we furnished ourselves with a new mizen-mast, spare yards and other spars, besides wood. It also afforded us excellent water, a variety of good fish and the shores with some excellent plants . . .” Munford, p. 69.

⁹⁵Burney, II, 39.

⁹⁶Cook and King, II, 212.

⁹⁷Cook and King, II, 226.

⁹⁸Burney, II, 39.

Kamtchatka. Cloathing made of these skins and a nother sort made, either of the bark of a tree or some plant like hemp; Weapons, such as Bows and Arrows, Spears &c^a Fish hooks and Instruments of various kinds, pieces of carved work and even human sculs and hands, and a variety of little articles too tedious to mention. For these things they took in exchange, Knives, chissels, pieces of iron & Tin, Nails, Buttons, or any kind of metal.⁹⁹

The Nootkas also swapped fish, whale oil, venison, and even wild garlic. But the Englishmen preferred furs. Midshipman Edward Riou of the *Discovery* wrote: "The Natives continue their Visits bringing with them apparently every thing they are in possession of, but nothing is so well received by us as skins, particularly those of the sea beaver or Otter, the fur of which is very soft and delicate."¹⁰⁰ The Indians also liked sea otter pelts. Their clothes were made of cedar bark, elk hide, and fur, especially sea otter fur, which was used for trimming as well as whole garments. As Clerke noted, "Of the Skin of the Sea Beaver is formed a great, & by them the most esteem'd part of their dress. . . ."¹⁰¹ The Englishmen literally bought the Nootkas' clothing off their backs! Ledyard summarized the trading:

We purchased while here about 1500 beaver,¹⁰² beside other skins, but took none but the best, having no thoughts at that time of using them to any other advantage than converting them to the purposes of cloathing, but it afterwards happened that skins which did not cost the purchaser sixpence sterling sold in China for 100 dollars. Neither did we purchase a quarter part of the beaver and other furrskins we might have done, and most certainly should have done had we known of meeting the opportunity of disposing of them to such an astonishing profit.¹⁰³

Midshipman James Trevenen of the *Resolution* was equally sanguine about the commercial prospects. He reported that William Bligh, master on the *Resolution* (and the future notorious captain of the *Bounty*), had traded at Tahiti a shilling hatchet for thirty green beads, for twelve

⁹⁹Beaglehole, III, 296-297.

¹⁰⁰Beaglehole, III, 296n.

¹⁰¹Beaglehole, III, 1325.

¹⁰²Including more than 300 on the *Discovery*. Rickman, p. 246.

¹⁰³Munford, p. 70.

of which he then exchanged on the Northwest Coast for six sea otter skins, which could have fetched an average of £15 each at Canton—making a return of £90 from 1 shilling.¹⁰⁴ On another occasion Trevenen himself traded a broken buckle at Nootka Sound for a “very fine” sea otter pelt that he sold at Canton for \$300.¹⁰⁵ Upon leaving Nootka Sound, Cook was importuned to return by the Indians, who promised to stock furs in that event.

In the Gulf of Alaska the expedition again met natives with furs to trade. In Prince William Sound iron and beads were exchanged for sea otter skins; half a dozen blue beads fetched a skin worth \$90 to \$100,¹⁰⁶ and in Cook Inlet pelts, salmon, and cranberries were acquired for “trifles.” By now Cook felt that fur trading along the Northwest Coast would be profitable. He wrote that “The fur of these creatures [sea otters] is certainly finer than that of any other animal we know of; consequently the discovery of this part of North America, where so valuable an article of commerce is to be procured, ought certainly to be considered as a matter of some consequence.”¹⁰⁷ “There is no doubt,” he added, “but a very beneficial fur trade might be carried on with the inhabitants of this vast coast”¹⁰⁸

As Cook’s ships neared the Aleutian Islands, the natives became more unwilling to trade. Unknown to the Englishmen, the Aleuts had been forbidden by their Russian overlords to truck with anyone else. And if Cook still had any doubts about the prospects of the maritime fur trade, they were dispelled by the Russians. At Unalaska he found that “their great object is the sea beaver or otter,” and he “never heard them inquire after any other animal. . . .”¹⁰⁹ He also learned that the Russian enterprise had originated with the second expedition of Bering, to whom the Russians paid great respect. The business was, Cook concluded, “very beneficial,” being “. . . of much private advantage to individuals, and of public utility to the Russian nation.”¹¹⁰ King, too, ob-

¹⁰⁴Christopher Lloyd and R. C. Anderson, eds., *A Memoir of James Trevenen* (Greenwich: Navy Records Society, 1959), pp. 21–22.

¹⁰⁵Lloyd and Anderson, p. 28.

¹⁰⁶Ellis, I, 243.

¹⁰⁷Cook and King, II, 235–236.

¹⁰⁸Beaglehole, III, 371.

¹⁰⁹Captain James Cook [and Captain James King], *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean* (London: C. Nicol and T. Cadell, 1784), II, 509.

¹¹⁰Captain James Cook, 497.

served that "The principal object of the Russian colonies amongst these Islands is the procuring of the Sea otter, which they sell to the Chinese at an exorbitant profit; where those Skins are not to be procur'd they have no settlements."¹¹¹ The Russians were found to be as "immoderately fond" of sea otters as they were of grog and tobacco. About fourteen Russian ships plied the maritime fur trade out of Okhotsk and Petropavlovsk,¹¹² and Unalaska alone cleared 100,000 rubles (20,000 pounds) annually from this traffic.¹¹³

Thus, Russia's lucrative sea otter trade was exposed by 1781, when the first accounts of Cook's last voyage by Rickman and Zimmerman were published. These and subsequent accounts, such as Ledyard's of 1783 and Cook's and King's of 1784, told readers that there were "great numbers" of sea otters along the Northwest Coast, that the natives were "quite keen" to trade sea otter pelts, taking bagatelles in exchange, and that the pelts had a "great value" in China. Among the first to utilize this information were two members of Cook's own expedition—Captain Dixon in the *Queen Charlotte* and Captain Portlock in the *King George*, who were on the coast in 1786. The first, however, was Captain Hanna in 1785 in, appropriately, the brig *Sea Otter*. In the late 1780s American vessels, mostly out of Boston, also entered the "Northwest trade," and by the end of the century they were out-competing the British.

Although their monopoly was now broken, the Russian traders still enjoyed several advantages, quite apart from their half-century head start. For one thing, they controlled the sources of those varieties of sea otter with the best pelts—Kurilian, Kamchatkan, and Aleutian. The Northwest Coast, New Albionian, and Californian varieties, which were accessible to the Yankee traders, were poorer in terms of color, texture, and thickness. The Russians also controlled the principal fur seal rookery—the Pribilof Islands. In addition, the Russians possessed the world's best hunters of sea otters in the Aleuts. These "marine Cossacks," with their maneuverable kayaks and unerring harpoons, were virtually enslaved by the Russians, who themselves really neither hunted nor traded but simply exacted. The Americans, on the other hand, had to be content with riskier and costlier shipside or shipboard trading with the Northwest Coast Indians, who occasionally attacked and even captured unwary trading vessels. Furthermore, the Russians had permanent bases

¹¹¹Beaglehole, III, 1446.

¹¹²Cook and King, IV, 157.

¹¹³Rickman, p. 289.

amid the sea otter grounds, while the Americans had to voyage from New England around the Horn and make the best of one or two trading seasons on the coast. Finally, the Russians had the vested interest and hence strong support of their tsar—at least from 1799, when the Russian-American Company was chartered under the aegis of the Russian Government to monopolize the exploitation and administration of Alaska.

Despite these advantages, the Russians failed to oust their American competitors. Thanks to Russia's entrepreneurial and technological backwardness—and American acumen in the same respects—the Yankee "coasters" had better ships, better sailors, and better trade goods. Also, the Americans were more imaginative and more ruthless traders. They were not loath, for example, to barter spirits and guns to the Tlingits and even to incite them against the neighboring Russians. Moreover, the Americans had access to Canton, which remained closed to the Russians, who had to market their furs via a more lengthy and more difficult route overland to Kyakhta. Then, too, the American shipmasters spread their commercial risk through diversification—sandalwooding from the South Sea Islands, smuggling and poaching along the western coast of New Spain, whaling in both halves of the Pacific, trafficking in hides and tallow from California, and even provisioning Russian Alaska. Only the financial power of the Hudson's Bay Company and managerial genius of George Simpson prevented the Americans from completely dominating the Northwest Coast.

Thus, thanks to Cook's third voyage, Russia was made aware that the Pacific was as much as "Western Sea" as it was an "Eastern Ocean." Cook himself, of course, did not live to see this happen, but it was the bold curiosity of this master mariner that documented Russia's first permanent settlement in America, underscored Russia's weakness in Kamchatka, and exposed Russia's monopoly on the sea otter trade. As a result, British and American rivals soon appeared in the far North Pacific and eventually halted Russian eastward expansion. That, however, is another story.

DR. JAMES R. GIBSON is Professor of Geography at York University, Toronto, Canada. A native of British Columbia, Dr. Gibson obtained his Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin-Madison under the late Andrew H. Clark. His specialty is the historical geography of Russian expansion,

particularly in Siberia and America. He is the author of *Feeding the Russian Fur Trade: Provisionment of the Okhotsk Seaboard and the Kamchatka Peninsula, 1639-1856* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969) and *Imperial Russia in Frontier America: The Changing Geography of Supply of Russian America, 1784-1867* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976) and editor of *European Settlement and Development in North America: Essays on Geographical Change in Honour and Memory of Andrew Hill Clark* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), as well as the author of a number of articles and translations in geographical, historical, and cartographical journals. At present Dr. Gibson is writing a book on agricultural settlement in the Oregon Country (1795-1846) and compiling a collection of sources on Russian California (1812-1841) for the Hakluyt Society.

THE BOTANICAL RESULTS OF CAPTAIN COOK'S THREE VOYAGES AND THEIR LATER INFLUENCE

by William T. Stearn

The contribution to knowledge deriving from a scientific expedition depends not only upon the quantity and quality of material gathered but also and equally upon the skill and speed with which this is studied and the resulting information published. As the gap between collecting and publication increases, so likewise does the probability of later duplicated effort making the original work of little or no practical value—historically interesting, a waste indeed of both labor and expenditure. A sad example of this is provided by the Spanish voyage to the Pacific Ocean under the command of Alessandro Malaspina in 1789–93. Its objectives were both scientific and political, as were those of Cook's voyages, which it sought to emulate. These included a survey of the Spanish possessions in the Pacific, their natural history, their mutual political and economic relations and the best routes for commercial navigation. On the voyage itself most of its aims were successful. Nevertheless, as said elsewhere, "in histories of Pacific exploration Malaspina's voyage usually receives the least attention, for no recording of undiscovered islands, no series of published charts, no major narratives stand to its credit. This was not the fault of its enterprising commander Alessandro Malaspina (1754–1809), an Italian aristocrat who spent most of his life in the service of Spain. The expedition was expertly planned, very well equipped and brilliantly staffed, and was potentially the most important to leave Spain."¹ It carried Thaddaeus Haenke, Luis Née, and Antonio Pineda as naturalists. Their devoted labors during the voyage came virtually to nothing in Spain on their return because of a lack of appreciation or mismanagement by officials; moreover an intrigue at the Spanish Court, apparently caused by jealousy of Malaspina's popularity and achievement, led to his imprisonment from 1796 to 1803. Consequently the only major botanical result of so much painstaking work in little-known regions on the expedition itself is C. Presl's *Reliquiae Haenkeanae* published not in Spain but in Bohemia in 1825–35, by which time other botanists had already described and named many of the new species. Thus the specimens collected by Haenke at Nootka Sound, Vancouver, in 1791 had to wait until 1825–35 for recording.

¹W. T. Stearn, An introduction to K. B. Presl's *Reliquiae Haenkeanae*, prefixed to facsimile of *Reliquiae Haenkeanae* (Amsterdam: A. Ascher, 1973).

The Malaspina voyage is indeed an extreme case of frustrated effort. Nevertheless, none of the eighteenth-century Pacific exploring voyages, even those of Bougainville, Cook, Vancouver, and d'Entrecasteaux, yielded natural history results commensurate with the collections and observations diligently made upon them. The reasons for these relative failures are various and complex, attributable partly to the characters of the leading persons concerned, partly to the inadequate organization of research at this time, partly sometimes to political and social circumstances. These must all be kept in mind when assessing the contribution to biological knowledge made by Cook's three voyages of discovery. Each one took able naturalists into then unexplored regions of the Pacific abounding with plants and animals new to science and presenting unimagined opportunities for collecting and recording. Each one brought back to England a wealth of specimens, notes, and drawings. As Whitehead has remarked, "there is indeed a lamentable contrast between the determination, courage, good planning and great care that attended the collection of all this material, and the series of delays, misfortunes, dissensions, intrigues (and at times downright malice) that so beset the publication of the results of the journals as well as of the scientific results."² In consequence, the far from negligible biological aspects of Cook's three voyages have tended to be obscured by the success of his cartographical work and his attention to health at sea. Nevertheless, despite piecemeal and incomplete publication, the botanical and zoological material from these voyages made a contribution to knowledge which, although it could have been much greater, remains important. It thus still merits study, as recent illustrated publications have made evident.³

The three voyages of Cook were, however, very different as regards their immediate impact and later influence despite having the Pacific Ocean with its continental bounds and multitudinous islands as their common field of enquiry and Cook as their commander. The contrasts

²P. J. Whitehead, *Forty Drawings of Fishes Made by the Artists Who Accompanied James Cook on His Three Voyages to the Pacific* (London: British Museum, 1968).

³A. C. Begg and N. C. Begg, *Dusky Bay*, 2nd ed. (Christchurch, New Zealand: Whitcombe & Tombs, 1968); W. Blunt and W. T. Stearn, *Captain Cook's Florilegium* (London: Lion & Unicorn Press at Royal College of Art, 1973); E. D. Merrill, *The Botany of Cook's Voyages* (Waltham, Mass.: Chronica Botanica, 1954); W. T. Stearn, "A Royal Society Appointment with Venus in 1969: The Voyage of Cook and Banks in the *Endeavour* in 1768-1771 and Its Botanical Results," *Notes and Rec. Royal Society*, London, 24 (1969), 64-90; W. T. Stearn, "Sir Joseph Banks (1743-1820) and Australian Botany," *Rec. Australian Academy of Science*, 2 (1974), iv, 7-24; and Whitehead as indicated in footnote 2.

illustrate the interplay of personalities and circumstances. The pioneering first voyage of 1768–71 in the *Endeavour* had wealthy young Joseph Banks and the erudite, genial Daniel Solander as its naturalists. The second of 1772–75 in the *Resolution* and *Discovery* had the erudite but easily disgruntled, self-opinionated Johann Reinhold Forster (rightly designated “the tactless philosopher” by Hoare)⁴ his brilliant, amiable, over-shadowed son George, and their competent, steady Swedish assistant, Andreas Sparrman, in many respects like his older compatriot Solander. The third and fatal voyage of 1776–80 had the consumptive naval surgeon William Anderson and the gardener David Nelson. These were men of very different character and achievement. Fortunately the generic names *Andersonia*, *Banksia*, *Forstera*, *Nelsonia*, *Solandra*, and *Sparmannia* impartially commemorate them all. The first voyage brought back the best, the most extensive, and the most valuable material but produced little of immediate biological importance. The second resulted in a publication immediately fixing the names of many plant genera but little else then. The third yielded virtually nothing at the time but even in 1976 provided material for the description of extinct Hawaiian species.

Cook's First Voyage

The avowed object of Cook's first voyage of global circumnavigation was astronomical, i.e., to observe in 1769 from a Pacific Ocean island the transit of the planet Venus across the disc of the sun, but its secret and political object was to search for the hypothetical great southern continent and ascertain its existence or otherwise because this could affect the balance of power in Europe between Britain and France. The British government made no provision for biological exploration. The natural history results were entirely due to the participation in the voyage of a private citizen, Joseph Banks (1743–1820), recommended by the Royal Society to the Admiralty as “a gentleman of large fortune who is well-versed in natural history.” He took with him Daniel Solander as scientific companion; H. Spöring as naturalist secretary, H. Buchan and Sydney Parkinson as artists, and two white and two black servants. He also took a good working library of natural history books, of which those by Solander's teacher, Linnaeus, would have been the most useful, and masses of collecting equipment. The

⁴Michael E. Hoare, *The Tactless Philosopher, Johann Reinhold Forster, 1729–1798* (Melbourne: Hawthorne Press, 1976).

Endeavour sailed from Plymouth on 26 August 1768 and many years passed before another ship left England so well furnished with scientific personnel and equipment. The voyage carried them to Madeira, Brazil, Tierra del Fuego, Tahiti, New Zealand, eastern Australia from Botany Bay to Cape York, and Java; everywhere possible they collected all they could and accordingly brought back to England on 15 July 1771 such a quantity of specimens, drawings, and notes as had never reached Europe before.

Banks planned to make this new knowledge available by publication but planned to do so in the grand style with superb folio engraved plates of the plants befitting the magnitude of the voyage. Herein one can detect the influence upon Banks of his social position and his earlier antiquarian interests; the *Endeavour* voyage had been for him the equivalent on a grander scale of the Grand-Tour customary in the education of an aristocratic young Englishman; large engraved illustrations became an essential feature of eighteenth-century works on antiquities. Unfortunately such illustrations made the whole of Banks's ambitious undertaking a costly failure. On the voyage, Solander wrote Latin descriptions of the plants that remain admirable: J. D. Hooker in the *Flora Novae-Zelandiae*⁵ stated that "his descriptions have never been surpassed for fulness, terseness and accuracy" and, coming from an authority on the New Zealand and Antarctic flora so scholarly and experienced as Hooker, that is praise indeed. A student of Linnaeus at Uppsala and well versed in the master's methods, Solander allocated the new genera and species to their positions within the Linnaean sexual system of classification and coined names for them which remaining too long unpublished have, as Hooker remarked, "in most cases been replaced by others, often applied with far less judgment." He had worked so hard on the voyage that the task of revising and completing his manuscripts and preparing them for publication when back in London cannot have daunted him. His completed manuscripts carefully transcribed and ready for printing, together with the descriptions made on the voyage are in the British Museum (Natural History), London. Those entitled *Primitiae Florae Terrae del Fuego*, *Primitiae Florae Insularum Pacifici*, and *Primitiae Florae Novae Zelandiae* could well have been published at the time without illustrations, as were most of the works of Linnaeus, and would have made a sound foundation for later publications. Extracts from these published by Blunt and Stearn exemplify their quality and indicate what was lost by their nonpublication ear-

⁵J. D. Hooker, *Flora Novae-Zelandae*, I (1853), iii.

lier.⁶ Solander also prepared descriptions of Australian plants, few of them published, however, before 1900! The quantity of New Zealand and Australian plants needing illustration almost overwhelmed the artist, Sydney Parkinson; he had to content himself with sketching the general habit of a plant to indicate the position and pose of its leaves, flowers, and fruits and then to paint carefully a few details of these to serve as guides for the preparation of complete colored drawings later. This he never had the opportunity to do. He died at sea between Java and the Cape of Good Hope on 26 January 1771, one of the many victims of malaria and dysentery caught during the enforced stay of the *Endeavour* at Batavia. Banks accordingly had to employ a group of artists in London to make completed drawings before the engravers could work on them. Under Solander's supervision they did this admirably, but it caused delay.

The number of plants collected, described, and portrayed is impressive. On Madeira during a stay of five days they got 230 species, of which twenty-three were determined as new to science and of which Parkinson made twenty-two colored drawings. Despite difficulties of going ashore there, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, yielded them 300 species, of which Parkinson drew thirty-five. At Tierra del Fuego, with a much poorer flora, they found, in January 1769, 104 species of flowering plants (*phanerogams*), six ferns, a *lycopodium*, and thirty-four mosses, etc., twenty-nine being then illustrated. Their stay in Tahiti lasted from April to July 1769 and Parkinson made fourteen sketches and 114 colored drawings of plants. Coastal New Zealand provided about 400 species; Parkinson illustrated 205. The landing on 3 May 1770 in New South Wales at Botany Bay, so named by Cook in allusion to the many astonishing new plants found there by Banks and Solander, acquainted them with yet another entirely new flora; hard-pressed Parkinson managed to illustrate eighty-four. Their stay at the Endeavour River, Queensland, from June to August 1770, while the reef-damaged *Endeavour* was being repaired, gave them better opportunities for botanizing because they had time to go further inland; here Parkinson illustrated 141 species. These Endeavour River drawings are especially valuable as they portray from life many species later described by various authors from the dried specimens.⁷ In Java, despite sickness, they likewise collected plants, of which Parkinson illustrated seventy-four. The deaths of Parkinson and Spöring and the illness of Banks and So-

⁶Blunt and Stearn, 1973.

⁷Stearn, 1969.

lander then brought botanical work on the voyage almost to an end. They had little opportunity to examine the plants of the Cape of Good Hope and St. Helena. Nevertheless, the botanical material resulting from the voyage was estimated to include about 3000 herbarium specimens and 955 drawings by Parkinson; 110 new genera and 1300 new species were represented. The scale of this addition can be gauged from Linnaeus's *Species Plantarum* (1753), having included 1098 genera and some 5900 species as the total for the whole known world in 1753.

Back in London, after a voyage to Iceland in 1772, Banks put in hand the preparation of folio volumes on the plants of the voyage. A first task was the completion of Parkinson's drawings. This took several years to do. Then came the engraving of the copper plates and that took even longer. Engraving plates with elaborate shading instead of coloring was necessarily a slow, highly skilled, and costly business which often delayed the appearance of illustrated works. The plates engraved for Banks by D. Mackenzie, G. Sibelius, G. Smith, and others are masterpieces of the engraver's art, as can be seen from the prints in *Captain Cook's Florilegium*.⁸ By 1778, about 550 plates had been engraved, so Banks told the younger Linnaeus then in London. Solander died on 13 May 1782 with the engraving of the plates not yet completed and none of his manuscript *Floras* printed. Banks had become president of the Royal Society in succession to Sir John Pringle and more and more diverse matters occupied his attention, but he still intended to publish the work. Thus he wrote in November 1784 that "it can be completed in two months if only the engravers can come to put the finishing touches to it." In all, 742 copper plates were engraved, most of which have survived and are now in the British Museum (Natural History), London. What happened thereafter to end all activity on what would have been the most impressive British botanical publication of the eighteenth century, a major contribution to the botany of the Pacific Ocean, is obscure and unlikely ever to be elucidated. The sad fact remains that the long-awaited fruit of Solander's intellectual labors and Banks's vast expenditure on the voyage and afterwards came to nothing then. All one can say about this failure is that, if Banks's ambition for the grandeur of the work had been less and Solander had had more ambition to see his manuscripts printed, then Cook's first voyage of discovery would have shone as botanically the most successful then made.

⁸Blunt and Stearn, 1973.

Cook's Second Voyage

Meanwhile, Cook had completed his second voyage, that of 1772-75, and the two Forsters, who had sailed with him aboard the *Resolution* in circumstances hard to endure, both for them and for Cook, had brought back their own harvest of specimens, sketches, and notes from the Pacific area. These included some 785 gatherings of plants and some 300 botanical drawings by George Forster, as well as much zoological material. Cook's track on this voyage coincided only in part with his previous one. Thus he did not touch Australia and Java but reached the New Hebrides and New Caledonia, which has a rich (now endangered) endemic flora. Tahiti, New Zealand (with a long fruitful stay in 1773 at Dusky Sound),⁹ and Tierra del Fuego were visited on both voyages, and thus inevitably the Forsters and Sparrman collected in these places many species found earlier. Forster and his son had originally little botanical knowledge but, profiting from the erudition and experience of Sparrman, who, like Solander, had studied under Linnaeus at Uppsala, they had prepared concise descriptions, with drawings of floral parts, for seventy-six new genera, about fifteen or more of which had been carefully described and named in Solander's unpublished manuscripts. Banks and Solander welcomed the two Forsters back—Sparrman had stayed in South Africa—gave them facilities for work in Banks's rich library and herbarium, and treated them generously. No inhibitions about publishing restrained the Forsters; they had a vested interest in quick publication, and indolence was not one of their failings. They arrived back in England on 30 July 1775 and within four months, i.e., in late November or early December 1775, they had got six copies printed in folio of a work entitled *Characteres Generum Plantarum quas in Itinere ad Insulas Maris Australis collegerunt, descripserunt, delinearunt Annis MDCCLXXII-MDCCLXXI Johannes Reinoldus Forster et Georgius Forster*. One of these, now in the King's Library at the British Library (formerly the library of the British Museum), London, they presented to King George III, to whom, presumably in the hope of royal favor, they had dedicated it with a long fulsome introduction. Later they sent one to Linnaeus, who received it in April 1776, but apparently none to Banks, although inclusion in his much-used library might have given it some claim to effective publication in 1775. One cannot accept the existence of one copy locked away and guarded in a king's private library and five others in the

⁹Begg and Begg, 1968.

hands of the authors as "distribution of printed matter (through sale, exchange or gift) to the general public or at least to institutions with libraries accessible to botanists generally" (*Int. Code Bot. Nomencl.* article 29). However the work was put on sale as a quarto volume on 1 March 1776, which can reasonably be taken as the date of valid publication of the new names in the *Characteres* and not 29 November 1775.¹⁰

Elizabeth Edgar has provided an English translation of its Latin preface.¹¹ This and George Forster's *Voyage round the World* (1777) state that the richness of the flora and fauna of the Cape of Good Hope, a "treasure house of natural history," convinced the Forsters that it would be beyond their powers to collect, describe, portray, and preserve (all at the same time) the multitudes of plants and animals here and in the regions yet to be visited, many of them likely to be new for science. Here, however, they had the good fortune to meet the likeable and competent young Swedish doctor Andreas Sparrman (1748-1820), *optimus et eruditissimus juvenis Andreas Sparrmannus, M.D. Upsaliensis, Magni Illustrisque Linnaei discipulus*, now enthusiastically investigating the Cape flora after a voyage to China as a ship's surgeon. Forster offered to pay him £50 a year and his expenses, his major task to be the description of the plants while Forster dealt with the animals and George drew both. Despite the attraction for him of the Cape, the wider prospect of the Pacific Ocean lured Sparrman into acceptance. Beaglehole has referred to Forster's "needless engagement of Sparrman at the Cape as an assistant."¹² Without him, however, the botanical harvest of the voyage might have been small, for he was an energetic collector, not enfeebled by poverty and ill health as the over-worked boy George had been, and neither of the Forsters then possessed his botanical knowledge and experience. In fact, it would seem not unfair to attribute the major botanical results of Captain Cook's first and second voyages, though unfortunately not their publication, to Linnaeus's well-trained "apostles," Solander and Sparrman.

¹⁰H. St. John, "The Date of Publication of Forster's *Characteres Generium Plantarum* and Its Relation to Contemporary Works," *Naturaliste Canad.* 88 (1971), 361-581. See also F. A. Stafleu and R. S. Cowan, *Taxonomic Literature: A Selective Guide*, vol. 1 (Utrecht: Bohn, Scheltema and Holkema, 1976).

¹¹Elizabeth Edgar, "Preface to *Characteres Generium Plantarum* by J. R. and G. Forster, 1776, a Translation," *New Zealand Jour. Bot.*, 7 (1969), 311-315.

¹²J. C. Beaglehole, ed., *The Journals of Captain James Cook*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society, 1955-1967), II (1961), *The Voyage of the Resolution and Adventure, 1771-1775*.

Although the *Characteres* according to its title-page has the two Forsters as its authors, George stated in 1792 that his father had had no share in the plant descriptions and that he and Sparrman had made them while his father busied himself with the animal species collected.¹³ Whoever was responsible, the *Characteres*, despite its shortcomings, remains a very important work. Here were first published the genera *Cyrtandra*, *Donatia*, *Euodia*, *Embothrium*, *Epacris*, *Dentella*, *Carpodetus*, *Dichondra*, *Commersonia*, *Schefflera*, *Phormium*, *Ripogonum*, *Gahnia*, *Acronychia*, *Haloragis*, *Polyscias*, *Tacca*, *Leptospermum*, *Barringtonia*, *Drimys*, *Plagianthus*, *Thelymitra*, *Balanophora*, *Artocarpus*, *Elatostemma*, *Aleurites*, *Meryta*, *Maba*, *Melicytus*, *Myroxylon*, *Pennantia*, *Aciphylla*, *Coprosma* and *Breynia*. Most of these are now well-known genera, some of them, such as *Schefflera* and *Elatostema*, large and widespread. A number had been described much better in Solander's manuscripts, but in their haste to publish the Forsters conveniently ignored this probability and thus have had their generic names and themselves as authors permanently imprinted on tropical botany.

Harsh words have been written about the Forsters and their conduct, but in considering this it is essential to distinguish between father and son. Johann Reinhold Forster (1729–1798) went on Cook's second voyage through the lucky chance that Banks did not. Earlier he had taught at the celebrated Warrington Academy for sons of dissenters excluded on religious grounds from the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, which was far from being "a small girls' school" as described by St. John.¹⁴ Here, as everywhere, Forster was his own worst enemy. To quote Beaglehole, "dogmatic, humourless, suspicious, pretentious, contentious, censorious, demanding, rheumatic, he was a problem from any angle,"¹⁵ not least for his unfortunate son George (1754–1794), who wrote in 1787 of "his active mind, his fiery temper, his contempt for money and his perpetual want of it . . . the situation can hardly be imagined where he might be said to be perfectly at his ease and in the enjoyment of real happiness." Nevertheless, Forster was a widely learned, very industrious, and observant scholar and perceptive, too, when his own interests and the characters of his fellowmen were not involved. In his later years at Halle he made important contributions to geographical and anthropological knowledge as Hoare's admirable, well-documented biography makes evident. George was seventeen years

¹³Hoare, 1976, p. 176.

¹⁴St. John, 1971.

¹⁵Beaglehole, II, xlii.

old when he accompanied his father as assistant, having already suffered much hardship, but he had become a skilled draftsman and on the voyage itself he provided numerous excellent drawings of its birds, fish, and plants.¹⁶ So vivid an impression did the isles of the Pacific make upon this highly intelligent, hard-working, sensitive, and artistic lad that years later his reminiscences filled young Alexander von Humboldt (1769–1859) with a burning desire to see and investigate the tropics. He and Humboldt traveled together down the Rhine and from Holland to England in 1790. To the end of his long life Humboldt remembered that journey and mused over his companion's tragic career. In 1846 he wrote that "gifted with refined aesthetic feeling, and retaining the fresh and living pictures with which Tahiti and the other fortunate islands of the Pacific had filled his imagination . . . George Forster was the first gracefully and pleasingly to depict the different gradations of vegetation, the relations of climate, and the different articles of food in their bearing on the habits and manners of different tribes. . . . The companionship I enjoyed on this journey, the sudden passion that seized me for everything connected with the sea, and for visiting tropical lands, all exerted a most powerful influence." That may indeed have been the most important even though indirect long-term scientific result of Cook's second voyage. There is a marked contrast between the meager published results of that and the other two voyages, and of Humboldt and Bonpland's expedition to South America and Central America in 1799–1804, which produced eighteen botanical volumes between 1805 and 1834, i.e. within a comparatively short time after their return to Europe.¹⁷

Apart from his share in the authorship of the *Characteres Generum Planterum*, George Forster published four small botanical works arising out of Cook's second voyage: a thesis at the university of Halle in 1786 *Dissertatio inauguralis botanico-medica de Plantis esculentis Insularum Oceani Australis* (Halle) followed by a bookseller's issue, *De Plantis esculentis Insularum Oceani Australis Commentatio botanica* (Berlin); *Florulae Insularum Australium Prodrromus* (Göttingen, 1786); two papers in *Novi Commentarii Societatis Regiae Scientiarum Gottingensis* 9 (1789), i.e., "*Fasciculus plantarum magellicarum*" (pp. 13–24) and "*Plantae atlanticae ex insulis Madeira, Sti. Jacobi, Adscensionis, Stae Helenae et*

¹⁶Begg and Begg, 1968; T. Iredale, "George Forster's Paintings," *Australian Zool.* 4 (1925), 48–53; and Whitehead, 1968.

¹⁷W. T. Stearn, *Humboldt, Bonpland, Kunth and Tropical American Botany* (Lehre: J. Cramer, 1968).

Fayal reportatae" (pp. 46-74). These show how much his botanical knowledge had advanced since the voyage. They describe many species which Banks and Solander had collected on the first voyage but, being published, they have an importance in botanical literature denied to Solander's more thorough but unpublished work.

A number of Forster specimens passed into the hands of the Swedish physician Abraham Bäck and thence to the younger Linnaeus, who described them in his *Supplementum Plantarum* (1781) but attributed them not to the Forsters but to the donor "Eques Bäck."¹⁸ This understandably annoyed J. R. Forster, who inserted an attack on Bäck in George's *De Plantis esculentis* unbeknown to George, when seeing that work through the press; this embarrassed George, who considered his father's action disgraceful, and it has puzzled later authors. The same work contains descriptions of many species based on specimens of Cook's first voyage collected by Banks and Solander. It was printed during the younger Linnaeus's stay in London.

Difficulties with the British authorities created by Forster led him to return to Germany in July 1780, taking his long-suffering family with him. His pig-headedness frustrated the efforts of his friends and alienated others. Unfortunately he had also created in the mind of Cook a hearty dislike for naturalists such as him aboard ship, so different from "the gentlemen" Banks and Solander of the first voyage. No naturalist purely as such was appointed for the third voyage. "Curse the natural philosophers and all science into the bargain" appears to have been the hasty reply of Cook, F.R.S., when questioned whether any naturalist would accompany him on that voyage. Instead, the Scottish surgeon William Anderson (1750-1778),¹⁹ who had been surgeon's first mate in the *Resolution* on the second voyage, had to serve both as the ship's doctor and naturalist on this one, doing that to which Banks, Solander, and Spöring on the first voyage and the Forsters and Sparrman on the second voyage had been able to devote their undivided attention and necessarily doing it not so well. He may be considered the first of a succession of naval surgeon-naturalists.

¹⁸A. W. Exell, "Specimens Attributed to Bäck in the *Supplementum Plantarum*," *J. Bot.* 69 (1931), 227-230; and H. O. Juel, "Notes on the Herbarium of Abraham Bäck, *Svenska Linné-Sällsk. Arrsskr.* 7 (1924), 68-82.

¹⁹J. J. Keevil, "William Anderson, 1774-1778, Master Surgeon, Royal Navy," *Ann. Medical Hist.*, N. S. 5 (1933), 511-524.

Cook's Third Voyage

The track of the third voyage (1776-1780) in the *Resolution* and *Discovery*, unlike the two earlier ones, was predominantly in the North Pacific, for his South Pacific sweeps as far as the Antarctic ice had disproved the existence of the supposed inhabitable great southern continent there, but the Northwest passage remained to be investigated. His route touched the Cape, Kerguelen Island, Tasmania, New Zealand, the Hawaiian Islands, and the northwest coast of North America extending from British Columbia northward into the Bering Strait. It thus included three hitherto unvisited areas, Tasmania, the Hawaiian Islands, and northwest America, with rich interesting floras as potentially fruitful of discovery as those of the earlier voyages. They yielded little for science then. It would be unfair to blame Anderson much for this. On some occasions he was probably too busy with his medical duties and with making zoological and ethnological observations and vocabularies of native languages; on others he may have been too unwell himself and accordingly lacked energy and incentive. He died at sea on 3 August 1778, aged about thirty, a victim of tuberculosis, like Clerke and Vancouver later, and was greatly mourned by his shipmates, for, as Cook wrote, "he was a sensible young man, well skilled in his profession, and had acquired much knowledge in other sciences." His specimens, possibly including many collected for him by the gardener, David Nelson, came eventually into the herbarium of Banks. Had he lived he would probably have published them himself. Nelson made an especially important collection in Hawaii which, although it consisted of only 130 specimens, nevertheless included some sixteen *taxa*, probably all now extinct, described as new by Harold St. John in 1976.

The most interesting of Anderson's finds was the Kerguelen Island cabbage (*Pringlea antiscorbutica* Hooker fil.), a member of the *Cruciferae*, endemic to that remote and desolate island of the southern Indian Ocean. In his journal he remarked that "it has not only the habit but the watery acrid taste and other qualities of the antiscorbutic plants [*Cruciferae*] and yet differs essentially from the whole tribe that we all look'd upon it as a production entirely peculiar to that place," as it certainly is. Anderson distinguished it as a new genus which he named *Pringlea* in honor of Sir John Pringle (1707-1782), physician general to the British army, the author of a standard work, *Observations on Diseases of the Army* (1752), and President of the Royal Society from 1772 to 1778, with whom Anderson had become acquainted (cf. Britten, 1916). His manuscript '*Genera nova Plantarum*' was never published

and the name *Pringlea* had to await publication until adopted by J. D. Hooker in 1845!

Thus from Cook's three voyages there arrived in London many hundreds of herbarium specimens gathered in the South Atlantic and the Pacific region, together with drawings and manuscripts, which represented many new genera and species but which yielded immediate publication of none, apart from the hastily produced *Characteres Generum Plantarum* of the Forsters. Most of this material became the property of Sir Joseph Banks (created a baronet in 1781). He also received many specimens from elsewhere and they all competed for the attention of his botanist-librarians, in succession Solander, Dryander, and Robert Brown, all hardworking botanists of great ability. After the death of Solander there was no incentive to study and publish the Cook material in preference to other material, especially as the major preoccupation of Solander and then Dryander was the preparation of the first edition of William Aiton's *Hortus Kewensis* (1789), a task requiring great botanical knowledge and scholarship, for which they received little credit. Ker-Gawler wrote in 1823²⁰ that "in the very title-page we see them robbed of the reward of their erudition . . . to give immortality and renown to vulgar ignorance, the names of native dunces being suffered to usurp the place belonging to the genius and talent of another land." The tasks that confronted them were too many and big to receive equal attention. Well-staffed botanical institutions did not exist then; the tradition, stemming from the massive achievements of Ray and Linnaeus, was that of the dedicated worker single-handedly accomplishing all despite other duties. By the last quarter of the eighteenth century, major taxonomic undertakings needed, for their completion within a reasonable time, an amount of collaboration without precedent, and an awareness of this did not become evident until well into the nineteenth century. Thus the failure to exploit fully the potentialities for research resulting from expeditions both then and later was a natural consequence of a lack of enough suitably employed botanists on the one hand, and on the other a lack of the strong imperialist motivation behind, for example, the great floristic works of the Hookers and their associates at Kew in the nineteenth century.

This does not mean that the specimens gathered on Cook's three voyages remained unstudied. Banks's library and herbarium conveniently placed for visitors at Soho Square in London were open for consultation by all interested persons, British and foreign alike, who wished

²⁰*Botanical Register*, 9 (1823), sub. t. 729.

to use them; the literature of the period abounds in references to them. Among those who found in the Banksian herbarium many undescribed species, which they later described and published, were the younger Linnaeus, Joseph Gaertner, Olof Swartz, Robert Brown and Augustin Pyrame de Candolle. Later, after the Banksian herbarium had passed into the keeping of the British Museum, J. D. Hooker consulted the Cook voyage specimens from New Zealand and Tierra del Fuego, R. J. Lowe those from Madeira, and George Bentham those from Australia. Botanists interested in the plants of these areas continue to consult them. The recent creation of a large national park in the Cooktown area of Queensland, Australia, is directly linked to awareness of its scientific and historic importance through association with publications based upon the specimens collected here in 1770 by Banks and Solander on Cook's *Endeavour* voyage.

Results and Influence

The influence of Cook's voyages on botany was also far-reaching in an indirect manner. He charted the way that others could follow. Thus, although Cook's landing in 1778 at Nootka Sound on the island later to bear the name of his midshipman Vancouver then gave no botanical results worth mentioning, he had established its position. Culnett came to Nootka in July 1787, thereby providing his surgeon Archibald Menzies with the opportunity to botanize there. Menzies came again in 1792 with Vancouver, now captain of the *Discovery*, and botanized further. His collections contained many species then new to science, later described from his material, among them *Chamaecyparis nootkatensis*, *Disporum smithii*, and *Pyrola picta*.

The participation of Banks in Cook's first voyage of discovery had an especially important effect, because it led him, as the influential president of the Royal Society, to establish the tradition that exploring ships of the British Royal Navy should carry a naturalist, usually a medical man, to make biological collections and observations. This tradition stemmed from Linnaeus, who had encouraged and helped his students to voyage abroad as naturalists. Thanks to this, Archibald Menzies sailed aboard the *Discovery* with Vancouver (who had twice sailed with Cook); Robert Brown on the *Investigator* with Flinders; Charles Darwin on the *Beagle* with FitzRoy; Joseph Hooker on the *Erebus* with Ross; and T. H. Huxley on the *Rattlesnake* with Stanley. Such voyages proved of great scientific importance, not simply for the valuable collections amassed but also for the opportunities they presented to the re-

ceptive and creative minds of those naturalists for observing the diversity and variation of living creatures in many different regions of the world and for thinking about their morphology and their distribution. It was not coincidental that the two doughty champions of the theory of evolution, Huxley and Hooker, had spent formative years on those voyages like Darwin himself. Cook set high standards of navigation and surveying for those who served under him and for those who followed him. The naturalists who sailed with him and after him manifested like standards of excellence in their work of collection and observation. Thereby they honored that great naval tradition associated with Cook and directly and indirectly made contributions to biology as far-reaching in their detail and influence as were his to the geography of the Pacific region.

DR. WILLIAM T. STEARN served as botanist in the Department of Botany, British Museum (Natural History) where he has had frequent occasion to study the material collected during Captain Cook's voyages. He is now a visiting professor in the Departments of Botany and of Agricultural Botany, University of Reading. His publications include, among others, *Some Beautiful Indian Trees* (1955), *Botanical Latin* (2nd. ed. and new impression, 1978), and *Captain Cook's Florilegium* (1973). His firsthand acquaintance with tropical vegetation began with war service in the R.A.F. in India and Burma followed later by visits to Jamaica, Queensland, Papua New Guinea, and Kenya. He is president of the Garden Society and Honorary Curator of the Linnean Society's botanical collections.

OTHER RELATED SOURCES

- Apfelbaum, Joan. "Collections of J. R. and J. G. D. Forster in the Herbarium of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia." *Notulae Naturae Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, 437 (1971).
- Beaglehole, J. C. *The Life of Captain James Cook*. London: The Hakluyt Society, 1974.
- Begg, A. C. and N. C. Begg. *James Cook and New Zealand*. Wellington: Government Printer, 1969.
- Britten, J. "William Anderson and the Plants of Captain Cook's Third Voyage." *J. Bot. (London)*, 54 (1916), 345-352 and 55 (1917), 54.
- Carolin, R. C. "J. R. and J. G. A. Forster and Their Collections." *Proc. Linnean Soc. New South Wales*, 88 (1963), 108-111.
- Hoare, Michael E. "Cook the Discoverer, an Essay by J. George Forster." *Rec. Australian Acad. Sci.*, II, IV (1972), 7-16.
- . "Ulysses or Incubus? J. R. Forster's First Period in England, 1766-1772." *J. Soc. Bibl. Nat. Hist.*, 7 (1976), 375-383.
- Iredale, T. "George Forster's Paintings." *Australian Zool.*, 4 (1925), 48-53.
- . "J. R. and G. Forster, Naturalists." *Emu*, 37 (1937), 35-99.
- Law, Joy. *Captain Cook's Florilegium*. London: Lion and Unicorn Press at Royal College of Art, 1976.
- Lysaght, Averil M. "Some Eighteenth-Century Bird Paintings in the Library of Sir Joseph Banks, 1743-1820." *Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), Hist. Ser. I* (1959), 251-371.
- Merrill, E. D. "Bibliographic Notes on G. Forster's *De Plantis Esculentis Insularum Oceani Australis*, 1768." *Pacific Sci.*, 8 (1954), 35-40.
- Stearn, W. T. "The Botanical Results of the *Endeavour* Voyage." *Endeavour*, 27 (1968), 3-10.
- Steiner, G. and L. Baege. *Vogel der Südsee: 23 Gouachen und Aquarelle nach Zeichnungen Georg Forsters*. Leipzig: Insel Verlag Anton Kippenberg, 1971.
- Veit, W., ed. *Captain James Cook: Image and Impact*. Melbourne: Hawthorne Press, 1972.

PUBLICATION OF COOK'S JOURNALS: SOME NEW SOURCES AND ASSESSMENTS

by Helen Wallis

In *A Tale of a Tub* Swift promised his readers a description of *Terra Australis Incognita* in ninety-six large folio volumes, compiled from 999 learned and pious authors, to be printed in 100,000 copies for the universal benefit of mankind. It would be idle to speculate whether those voyages which swept the southern continent from the map have collected their quota of 999 authors. Suffice it to say that the *Bibliography of Captain James Cook*, compiled by Miss M. K. Beddie of the Library of New South Wales, second edition 1970, lists 4808 separate items (including relics), held in the Library of New South Wales, together with selected items in other Australian collections. The items range from printed and manuscript accounts of the voyages to posters advertising the pantomime ballet "The Death of Captain Cook." Their various languages and imprints indicate Cook's commanding position as an explorer and a navigator who transcended nationality, gaining the interest and admiration of many countries and several continents.

The last thirty years have been a major advance in Pacific studies, leading up to the climax of Cook bicentenary celebrations, 1978 to 1979. The publication of the authoritative texts of the journals was the achievement of the Hakluyt Society and its chosen editor, John Cawte Beaglehole. The supplementary volume, the life of Cook, was in typescript when Beaglehole died in October 1971. Born and bred in windy Wellington, he had the advantage of being a man of the Pacific. Privileged to undertake the task of liaison, the British Museum (along with the National Maritime Museum) was also to become a centre of intelligence for Cook and his fellow circumnavigators. For this reason I venture to survey some recent discoveries and assessments.

The Publications: Hawkesworth's *Voyages*

The controversy over Hawkesworth's *Voyages* features as one of the more curious repercussions of Cook's first voyage. Until 1955, when Beaglehole's edition, *The Voyage of the Endeavour 1768-1771*, appeared in print, Hawkesworth's *Voyages* had remained the chief authority for Cook's first voyage and also for the preceding circumnavigations of John Byron (1764-66), Samuel Wallis (1766-68), and Philip Carteret (1766-69). Only for that of Wallis had Hawkesworth been supple-

mented by a new text, the Journal of George Robertson, master of the *Dolphin*, published by the Hakluyt Society in 1948 under the title *The Discovery of Tahiti*. For a hundred and twenty years, as Beaglehole observed, so far as the first voyage was concerned, Hawkesworth was Cook.¹

Beaglehole tells in the words of Fanny Burney's diary, the well-known story how Hawkesworth came to be chosen "to write the Voyage." "My father has had a happy opportunity of extremely obliging Dr. Hawkesworth," she wrote on 15 September 1771. Her father, Charles Burney, had met Lord Sandwich, First Lord of the Admiralty, at Lord Orford's in Norfolk. Talking of the late voyage round the world, Lord Sandwich mentioned that he had the papers in his possession, but they were "rough drafts" and "he should be much obliged to any one who could recommend a proper person to *write the Voyage*." Her father immediately named Dr. Hawkesworth, and Lord Sandwich accepted the nomination. "The Doctor waited upon Lord Sandwich, and they both returned my father particular thanks for their meeting."² Edmond Malone was to claim that David Garrick the actor was responsible for securing Hawkesworth the commission,³ and Nichols also mentions this.⁴ The two reports were not mutually exclusive; as Beaglehole commented, the First Lord may well have asked advice of divers persons. I discovered by accident the evidence to support this assumption. Garrick was (in modern parlance) the second referee. In the margin of the Burney newspapers, the eighteenth-century collection of newspapers presented by Dr. Charles Burney to the British Museum, a letter which refers to Garrick's grievance carries a marginal manuscript note in Burney's hand: "It was Dr. Burney, who in recommending Dr. Hawkesworth to Lord Sandwich at Houghton, referring his Lordship to Garrick for a confirmation of the character which he had given of Dr. Hawkesworth as an ingenious writer and honourable man."⁵ It is easy

¹J. C. Beaglehole, ed., *The Journals of Captain James Cook*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society, 1955-1967), I, ccliii.

²Annie R. Ellis, ed., *The Early Diary of Frances Burney, 1768-1778*, 2 vols. (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1889), I, 133-134.

³George B. N. Hill, ed., *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, 6 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1934), II, 247 n. 5.

⁴John Nichols, *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, 8 vols. (London: Nichols, son and Bentley, 1817-1858), I, 140.

⁵*The Morning Chronicle*, 19 June 1773. For further comments, see Helen Wallis, *Carteret's Voyage round the World, 1766-1769*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society, 1965), II, 464-465.

to see how the misunderstanding arose which lost Hawkesworth Garrick's friendship. On the strength of his recommendation, Garrick considered that Hawkesworth should have consulted him over the publisher and allowed him a cut of the profits.

This was a minor issue in the controversy which raged once the *Voyages* came out. Horace Walpole had commented in May 1773 on the public mood of expectancy in awaiting the publication: "at present our ears listen and our eyes are expecting East Indian affairs, and Mr. Banks's voyage, for which Dr. Hawkesworth has received *d'avance* one thousand pounds from the voyager, and six thousand from the book-sellers, Strahan & Co., who will take due care that we shall read nothing else till they meet with such another pennyworth."⁶ For his work of editing the three volumes, running to 1500 pages, Hawkesworth was to receive £6,000. When we compare this figure with the sum of nearly £10,000 raised by subscription in 1717 to 1720 to build the Senate House at Cambridge, we can say that this was one of the most lucrative literary contracts of the eighteenth century. The publication was a highly profitable enterprise for all concerned, as the *Voyages* turned out to be a best-seller. By the end of 1773, a second English edition and a New York edition had appeared. French and German editions followed in 1774. The work also came out in shilling parts, entitled *Genuine Voyages to the South Seas, publishing in sixty weekly numbers*.

Despite its commercial success, the *Voyages* aroused a storm of criticism. When Hawkesworth died six months later, in November 1773, his death was attributed to the abuse that he had received. It was rumored that he had taken an overdose of opium. Fanny Burney attributed his death to "the uneasiness of his mind, which brought on a slow fever, that proved mortal."⁷ The critics of the *Voyages* ranged from the commanders themselves, the most reticent party in the controversy, to reviewers, literary men, and other public figures of the day. Some criticized Hawkesworth for his techniques of editing. Others disapproved of the content of the *Voyages*. Hawkesworth was also censured for accepting the commission on the terms agreed. It is evident, too, that shafts directed at Hawkesworth were aimed at the men behind him.

The criticisms of the content of the *Voyages* are wittily described by Beaglehole. Morality, theology, and geography had been affronted.

⁶Paget Toynbee, *The Letters of Horace Walpole*, 19 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903-1925), VIII, 277.

⁷Ellis, I, 262-264.

On the questions of morality, the account of Tahitian customs had brought blushes to the cheeks of all the ladies in England. None of them dared to admit that she had read the *Voyages*, especially when—to quote one of the writers of the time—"a lax magazine culled from the *Voyages* all the warmest passages to make a new art of love." You might have supposed from the criticism levelled against him that Dr. Hawkesworth had participated in the Tahitian customs—guilt by association. He had invited attack by suggesting that morality was relative, that what was immoral in one country was not necessarily immoral in another; he had said "these people had a knowledge of right and wrong from the dictates of natural conscience."

As to the theological issue, Hawkesworth had ventured unorthodox views in his preface. He explained that he could not attribute any of the critical escapes from danger "to the particular interpositions of Providence;" the dangers themselves were also part of the Divine order of things. When the *Endeavour* was stuck on the reef he considered that "we can with no more propriety say that providentially the wind ceased, than that providentially the sun rose in the morning." The reviewer in the *Annual Register* commented: "we could wish . . . that speculative opinions of dark and difficult subjects had been omitted; whatever their merit may be, we may truly say, *non erat his locus*."⁸

Thirdly, geography was affronted. Alexander Dalrymple took up the cudgels as its protagonist. Angry with Cook and the Admiralty because he had not himself been chosen to command the voyage, Dalrymple professed disbelief of Cook's report that there was no tropical southern continent. In an attack published as a letter to Hawkesworth, he vented his disappointment.⁹ Hawkesworth answered facetiously in the preface to the second edition: "I am very sorry for the discontented state of this good Gentleman's mind, and most sincerely wish that a southern continent may be found, as I am confident nothing else can make him happy and good-humoured."¹⁰ Dalrymple countered in a second letter, which he withheld from publication on the news of Hawkesworth's death.¹¹

⁸*Annual Register for the Year 1773*, p. 267.

⁹Alexander Dalrymple, *A Letter from Mr. Dalrymple to Dr. Hawkesworth, occasioned by some groundless and illiberal imputations in his Account of the late Voyages to the South* (London: J. Nourse, 1773).

¹⁰John Hawkesworth, *An Account of the Voyages*, 3 vols. (London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell, 1773), preface.

¹¹Alexander Dalrymple, *Mr. Dalrymple's Observations on Dr. Hawkesworth's Preface to the Second Edition* (London: Privately Printed, 1773).

If Dalrymple's criticisms were unfair, so also were some of the other comments on the *Voyages*. Hawkesworth could not please everybody. Literary critics thought that there was too much nautical information in the *Voyages*. Horace Walpole wrote: "I have almost waded through Dr. Hawkesworth's three volumes of the *Voyages to the South Sea*. The entertaining matter would not fill half a volume: and at best is but an account of the fisherman on the coasts of forty islands."¹² Of Hawkesworth's book, Dr. Johnson said to Boswell (7 May 1773): "Sir, if you talk of it as a subject of commerce, 'twill be gainful. If as a Book, that is to increase human knowledge, not much of that. Hawkesworth can tell only what Banks tells him, and he has not found much. But one Animal [presumably the Kangaroo]. BOSWELL. 'Many insects.' JOHN-SON. 'Ray reckons of british Insects 20,000 species.' Banks might have staid at home and discovered enough in that way."¹³

The Commanders criticised Hawkesworth for the opposite fault, his omission of navigational details. In England (as opposed to France with its *Service Hydrographique*), accounts of voyages necessarily served as handbooks of navigation since there was as yet no official government naval establishment responsible for publishing charts and pilot books. Thus the mutineers of the *Bounty* were able to seek Pitcairn Island as their refuge in 1790 because they had on board Hawkesworth's volumes and read therein the report of Carteret's discovery in 1767.

The fourth count against Hawkesworth turned on the nature of the commission. It was regarded as scandalous that Hawkesworth should pocket £6,000 for what one reviewer called "the easy Business of a few Months, transacted by a Man's own Fireside, whereas the commanders who had made the voyages at the risk of their lives and had written the original manuscripts obtained not one penny of profit from all the transaction."¹⁴ As the commanders had not received fair recompense the injustice here lay in their treatment by the Admiralty. The critics were hitting at the Admiralty as much as at Hawkesworth.

The rights and wrongs of the controversy can now be assessed in the light of some new sources. First, the publication of the voyages

¹²Walpole's *Letters*, VIII, 303. In the same vein (pp. 300-301), "The Admiralty have dragged the whole ocean, and caught nothing but the fry of ungrown islands, which had slipped through the meshes of the Spaniard's net. They fetched blood of a great whale called *Terra Australis Incognita*, but saw nothing but its tail."

¹³Geoffrey Scott, ed., *Private Papers of James Boswell from Malahide Castle*, 18 vols. (Mount Vernon, New York: W. E. Rudge, 1928-1934), VI, 133.

¹⁴Letter to the printer from "Navalis," *Baldwin's London Weekly Journal*, 22 May 1773.

called forth a spate of letters which were printed in the correspondence columns of the London newspapers. Not a day passed in the summer of 1773 without letters appearing on the *Voyages*. These provide a running commentary on the progress of the controversy. Secondly, the manuscript journals of the circumnavigations of John Byron, Samuel Wallis, and Philip Carteret add to the evidence available for assessing Hawkesworth's style as an editor. Byron's manuscript journal appeared in the London sale-room of Messrs. Hodgson & Co. in 1957 and was purchased by the National Maritime Museum. This was the manuscript which Hawkesworth used, and it bears his annotations. It was edited by R. E. Gallagher and published by the Hakluyt Society in 1964. Samuel Wallis's journal was sold by his descendants and is now in the Mitchell Library (the Library of New South Wales), Sydney. This has not yet been published. Carteret's family papers came into the hands of Maggs Brothers in 1933. The journal and logs with other papers relating to the voyage were purchased by Sir William Dixon, and bequeathed by him to the Public Library of New South Wales as part of the Dixon Library. The remaining papers were bought by the National Maritime Museum.

These documentary sources have helped to solve the main problem of Hawkesworth's editing, the conflict of testimony. According to Hawkesworth, the accounts were read to the commanders, who are said to have perused and approved the manuscripts, and "such emendations as they suggested were made."¹⁵ The commanders themselves denied this. It was not true, Cook asserted, that Banks and he had revised all the book. Moreover, in what they had revised, Hawkesworth would make no alteration.¹⁶ Byron, Wallis, and Carteret are reported likewise to have protested against Dr. Hawkesworth's account, though their protest seems to have been made in private rather than in public. Dalrymple wrote of the commanders that "every man who had had any conversation with them must be satisfied that their silence cannot be construed as *acquiescence* of all the *sentiments* the Doctor has published."¹⁷ In a page of rough notes Carteret explained that Hawkesworth's misrepresentations had driven him to write his own ac-

¹⁵Hawkesworth, I, vi, General Introduction.

¹⁶A conversation between James Boswell and Cook at Sir John Pringle's in 1776. Scott, XI, 218. See also Beaglehole, II, 661, for Cook's comments written during his visit to St. Helena in May of 1775, when he first saw Hawkesworth's *Voyages*.

¹⁷Dalrymple, *Observations*, p. 7.

count of his voyage which he intended to publish.¹⁸ Carteret never managed to publish his own version, which formed part of the text for my edition published by the Hakluyt Society in 1965.

This conflicting evidence is difficult to reconcile with the fact that Hawkesworth was an honorable man, however misguided as an editor. A clue to the answer lies in an unsigned letter published in the *Public Advertiser* on 17 July 1773; written by a man who called himself "a Seaman," and claimed to have inside information. He stated that "Dr. H. submitted his Papers to the Examination and Correction (not of Scribblers, Witlings and Women) of a select Number of the most able and intelligent Seamen, of great Service and high Rank in their Profession." These men approved the "Stile, Manner and Contents." If the commanders themselves had seen the text, we would assume that the "Seaman" would have said so. Evidently, Hawkesworth handed his drafts to Lord Sandwich, who submitted them to competent naval men, possibly certain of the Lords of the Admiralty. Only part of the text was seen by the commanders; of the 1500 pages of text the greater part presumably was not read to them. The corrections which they did make were not incorporated. For these failures and omissions the blame must lie with Lord Sandwich. As First Lord of the Admiralty he should have safeguarded the rights of the commanders. On this view Hawkesworth wrote in good faith when he said that the accounts had been submitted to the Commanders. He may not have realized that the Commanders had not been the chief authority for approving the *Voyages*. They themselves were not free to complain. Another letter in the newspapers (from "Navalis") asserts that "they are enjoined, with the Spirit of a Tribunal resembling the Spanish Inquisition, an eternal Silence upon the Subject."¹⁹

Hawkesworth's faults of editing are consistent with this explanation. The "competent seamen" presumably did not notice any serious errors or omissions, whereas the men who had made the voyages and written the original journals would be well aware that the whole text had been altered by subtle or blatant changes of wording. On Byron's voyage the most interesting episode had been Byron's encounter with the Patagonian giants; the story had gone round that these men were nine feet high. What Byron wrote in his journal was "These People who in size come the nearest to Giants I believe of any People in the World."²⁰

¹⁸Dixon Library, Carteret papers, MS 11a. Printed in Wallis, I, 3. See also II, 509.

¹⁹Baldwin's *London Weekly Journal*, 22 May 1773.

²⁰Robert E. Gallagher, ed., *Byron's Journal of his Circumnavigation, 1764-1766* (Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society, 1964), p. 46.

Hawkesworth changed this to "these people may indeed more properly be called giants than tall men."²¹ Although Carteret and Wallis had measured the man and found them to be not much more than six feet, Hawkesworth in his introduction said that the Commanders had proved that the giants existed.²² For Wallis's voyage the visit to Tahiti was the most sensational episode. Wallis's relations with the Tahitian ladies, especially their "Queen," were described by Hawkesworth in terms which were embarrassingly sentimental. Where Wallis had written "The Queen", Hawkesworth changed this to "my princess, or rather queen." As Hawkesworth goes on to describe how on the Queen's orders the Tahitians carried Wallis to her house, the whole episode made him the butt of London wits.²³ With Carteret's voyage the changes comprise mainly a suppression of the facts on controversial subjects. Complaints made by Carteret against the Admiralty, Wallis, and the Dutch are omitted or toned down. There is no reference to the Englishman Nicholas Ray who held secret talks with Carteret at Makassar in Celebes. This suggests censorship on the part of the Admiralty rather than by Hawkesworth, whose journalistic instinct was to improve on a good story.²⁴

For Cook's first voyage, which suffered the greatest alteration, Cook's own words, recorded by Boswell, are the best comment. Cook was said to have seen a nation of men like monkeys. Cook said "No. I did not say they were like Monkeys. I said their faces put me in mind of monkeys." He went on to explain that Hawkesworth made a general conclusion from a particular fact, and would take as a fact what they had only heard. "Why, Sir," said Boswell, "Hawkesworth has used your narrative as a London Tavernkeeper does wine. He has *brewed it*."²⁵

Hawkesworth had been confident of his ability to fulfill the commission with credit. He called it "the most important transaction of my

²¹Hawkesworth, I, 31.

²²Hawkesworth, I, xvi. See Also Helen Wallis, "The Patagonian Giants," in Gallagher, p. 191.

²³Hawkesworth, I, 462. "Dr. Hawkesworth is still more provoking," writes Horace Walpole. "An old black gentlewoman of forty carries Captain Wallis across a river, when he was too weak to walk, and the man represents them as a new edition of Dido and Aeneas." Walpole's *Letters*, VIII, 292-293. See N. A. Rowe, *Voyage to the Amorous Islands* (London: A. Deutsch, 1955), p. 238 for further comment.

²⁴Wallis, II, 473.

²⁵Scott, XI, 218.

life." He wrote to Dr. Burney that he hoped to make the work "another Anson's Voyage."²⁶ This was ambitious indeed. The account of Anson's Voyage (1740-44), published in 1748 ostensibly by Richard Walter, in fact written by Benjamin Robins, was acclaimed a masterpiece. Hawkesworth had two practical problems to overcome. The first was the timetable. He had little over four months for producing the text of Cook's voyage, so that Cook could approve it before his departure on the second voyage. Secondly (although this to him was no problem), he was ignorant of naval affairs. When taken to task by Dalrymple for not having read Dalrymple's book *An Account of the Discoveries in the South Pacific Ocean* he answered complacently, "I never had time to read for amusement, and my literary pursuits had not led me to that path in which alone this Gentleman seems to have wandered the greater part of his life."²⁷

Hawkesworth's ignorance of naval affairs did not deter him from boldly rewriting the *Voyages*, paraphrasing almost every sentence and putting the whole into the flowing prose of the eighteenth-century essayist. Although the wording was his own, he decided to use the first person, so as to bring "the Adventurer and the Reader nearer together, without the intervention of a stranger." Yet he also ventured to interperse "such sentiments and observations as my subject would suggest."²⁸ These comments of his own were not numerous," so he claimed, and were justified because the manuscripts were to be submitted to the commanders for their approval. Therefore "it would signify little who conceived the sentiments that should be expressed." His comments are inserted mainly in Cook's voyage because he wrote this first, and because for this voyage he had a second source which he liked better than Cook, namely Banks's journal. Sir Joseph Banks, scholar and gentleman, was more to Hawkesworth's taste than Cook. Hawkesworth accordingly incorporated Banks freely into Cook's account, troubled only by the thought that this might seem unfair to Banks, since the results appeared under another name, "but this objection he [Banks] generously over-ruled."²⁹ The resulting amalgamation of two men's minds in one voice produces an incongruous effect. The reviewer of the *Voyages* in the *Annual Register* for 1773 said, "Neither are we quite convinced

²⁶Frances Burney, *Memoirs of Dr. Burney*, 3 vols. (London: E. Moxon, 1832), I, 269.

²⁷Hawkesworth *Voyages*, 2nd ed. (1773), I, preface, sig. A 3^v.

²⁸Hawkesworth *Voyages*, I, iv-v, General Introduction.

²⁹Hawkesworth, II, xiii-xiv.

by the Doctor's reasons, that it was altogether necessary to narrate in the first person."³⁰

The work of editing had not been "the easy business transacted at a man's fireside," as Hawkesworth's critics alleged. A letter from Mrs. Hawkesworth to Mrs. Garrick tells of "that Mind whose powers have for a long time been exerted almost to agony, but manifestly so as to have really destroyed Ye Fragile Fabric of the Body."³¹ The task had been beyond Hawkesworth's competence. His success as editor of *The Adventurer* (in association with Dr. Johnson) had "elated him too much."³² Friends and enemies alike considered him to have been spoilt by his worldly success.³³ His ideas of morality led Dr. Johnson to refer to him, after they had quarreled as "some swelling moralist."

And then there was the business of the £6,000. The anonymous "Seaman" who wrote to the newspapers alleged that it had originally been decided to pay Hawkesworth a fee. "It was, however, afterwards thought more proper to give him the Property of the Book that he might make the most of it."³⁴ In his second letter of thanks to Dr. Burney, Hawkesworth had rejoiced that "the property of the work will be my own."³⁵ As the Commanders had not received great recompense, the injustice here was their treatment by the Admiralty, and critics of Hawkesworth were hitting indirectly at the Lords of the Admiralty.

The figure of £6,000 was in everyone's mind when Hawkesworth died. "I believe he has had reason to detest the fortune which only preceded detraction and defamation," Fanny Burney wrote after his death on 16 November 1773. Mrs. Piozzi comments similarly, "Poor Dr. Hawkesworth! hunted out of his Life for that unlucky six thousand Pounds which at last he never received. . . ."³⁶ As for Mrs. Hawkesworth, who lived on to gain the financial benefits of the publication,

³⁰*Annual Register for 1773*, p. 267.

³¹Manuscript letter in the Hyde collection for which references I am indebted to Dr. R. E. Gallagher.

³²Sir John Hawkins, *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, 2nd ed. (London: J. Buckland, 1787), p. 312.

³³For example, Hawkins (see note above) and Edmund Malone, one of Hawkesworth's bitterest critics. See Sir James Prior, *Life of Edmund Malone* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1860), p. 441.

³⁴Unsigned letter in *The Public Advertiser*, 17 July 1773.

³⁵*Memoirs of Dr. Burney*, I, 269.

³⁶Katharine C. Balderston, ed., *Thraliana. The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (Later Mrs. Piozzi), 1776-1809*, 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), I, 328.

she wrote in a letter to Sir James Cadwell on 20 July 1776 that it had delivered "the *Coup de grace* to all my hopes of happiness on earth."³⁷

It is paradoxical that Hawkesworth's literary reputation, which had been the equal almost of Dr. Johnson's, was destroyed by the book which also preserved his name for posterity. The *Voyages* were, and always will be, *Hawkesworth's Voyages*. For all his faults as editor, Hawkesworth's achievement is not unfairly summed up in the anonymous letter from a Seaman: "I am a Seaman and have a Right to judge of this Performance; upon the Whole I do say that it gives a very edifying and entertaining Account of the most extraordinary Voyages ever attempted, and furnishes a speculative Mind with a great Variety of new Features of human Nature. It may be called a real authentic Account of a new World, such as no European could have figured in his own Imagination."³⁸

Cook's Second Voyage (1772-1775)

The Admiralty learnt its lesson from the controversy over Hawkesworth's *Voyages*. For Cook's second voyage their Lordships were prepared to allow the Commander to speak for himself. A major task for Cook on his return from the second voyage was therefore the preparation of his manuscript for the printer, although he was not expected to do this unaided. Discreetly, it was arranged that he should be helped by John Douglas, Canon of Windsor (he became Canon of St. Paul's in 1776). In an autobiographical memoir Douglas writes, "In 1776 & 1777 I prepared Cap^t. Cooke's Voyage for the Press. I undertook this Task at y^e earnest Intreaty of Lord Sandwich, & on Condition of Secrecy. His Majesty acquainted with it. I did a greal deal to y^e Cap^t's Journal to correct its Stile; to new point it; to divide it in to Sentences, & Paragraphs, & Chapters & Books. Tho little appears to be done by me, the Journal if printed as the Captain put it into my Hands, would have been thought too incorrect, & have disgusted the Reader."³⁹

As Beaglehole points out, this was an understatement.⁴⁰ The style was changed in the process of polishing, although the matter was not

³⁷Letter of Mrs. Hawkesworth to Sir James Caldwell, 20 July 1777. Printed in "Johnsoniana from the Bagshawe Muniments in the John Rylands Library . . ." Reprinted from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 35 (1952), 223.

³⁸Unsigned letter to the printer, *The Public Advertiser*, 17 July 1773.

³⁹B. L. Egerton MS 2181, fol. 42v.

⁴⁰Beaglehole, III, cxliv.

drastically altered. It was Cook himself, moreover, who had divided the work into chapters, as shown by his draft,⁴¹ and as stated in one of Cook's letters to Douglas.⁴² Both Cook and Douglas agreed that some prudent editing of substance was also necessary. Cook wrote to Douglas on 10 January 1776, "The remarks you have made on Bits of loose paper, I find very just. With respect to the Amours of my People at Otaheite & other places: I think it will not be necessary to mention them at all, unless it be by way of throwing a light on the Characters, or Customs of the People we are then among; and even then I would have it done in such a manner as might be unexceptionable to the nicest readers. In short my desire is that nothing indecent may appear in the whole book, and you cannot oblige me more than by pointing out whatever may appear to you as such."⁴³

The problem of what tense to use, past or present, also exercised Cook; and here he felt the dead hand of Dr. Hawkesworth. He wrote to Douglas on 9 March 1776, "As I intend to look over my whole Manuscript I shall have an opportunity to make such alterations as may appear necessary, to bring it, either to the present, or past times. If you will be so obliging as to give me your opinion in this matter—It was first written in the present time, but on find[ing] Dr. Hawkesworth had mostly used the past, I set about altering it, but I find many places has escaped me."⁴⁴ Other letters to Douglas show that the nautical sections were checked by Captain Campbell and Sir Hugh Palliser.⁴⁵

Cook's main problem concerned his negotiations with the arrogant and cantankerous elder Johann Reinhold Forster, who had expected to be the official historian of the voyage, and at one stage a joint work had been considered.⁴⁶ Then Lord Sandwich proposed a separate scientific volume by Forster, but this plan also foundered, and Cook was able to write to Douglas on 23 June 1776, "It is now Settled that I am to Publish without Mr Forster and I have taken my measures accord-

⁴¹B. L. Add. MS 27889.

⁴²26 April 1776. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 9.

⁴³B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 3.

⁴⁴B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 7.

⁴⁵Letters of 26 April, 14 June, and 23 June 1776. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 9, 15^v and 17.

⁴⁶Thus Daniel Wray comments in a letter to Lord Hardwicke (9 Dec 1775): "The basis of the book is to be *Captain Cook's Journal*, with proper additions from *Forster's* papers, who is to write it, but subject occasionally to correction." Nichols, *Illustrations*, I, 154–155.

ingly. When Captain Campbell has looked over the M.S. it will be put into the hands of Mr Strahan and Mr Stuart to be printed, and I shall hope for the Continuation of your assistance in correcting the proofs. I know not how to recompence you for the trouble you have had, and will have in the Work." The next day Cook was joining his ship at the Nore, and he ended his letter with his last words to Douglas: "I shall always have a due sence of the favors you have done."⁴⁷

When *A Voyage towards the South Pole* was published, it carried in its "Author's acknowledgement" Cook's expression of gratitude to "some worthy friends" (unnamed), and a disavowal of any literary pretensions: "On reading over the Journal, I found I had omitted some things and others were not sufficiently explained; these defects are attempted to be made up by notes; In short, I have given the most candid and best account of things I was able; I have neither Natural, nor acquired abilities for writing; I have been, I may say, constantly at Sea from my Youth and have draged myself (with the assistance of a few good friends) through all the Stations belonging to a Seaman, from a Prentice boy to a Commander:- After such a Candid confession, I shall hope to be excused for all the blunders that will appear in this Journal." This is the earliest extant version of the passage as it appears in the "Admiralty" MS Journal before the wording was polished by Cook in his holograph Journal⁴⁸ and then further refined by Douglas for publication.⁴⁹ Cook never saw the two fine folio volumes bearing his name as author which appeared in May 1777.

The major recent discovery relating to the second voyage concerns not Cook but the Forsters. When Forster's negotiations with the Admiralty broke down, Reinhold was forbidden to publish until the official account appeared. In anger, he gave his son George the task of writing the voyage. George Forster's two volumes, *A Voyage round the World* . . . , were published in London in March 1777, six weeks before the official volumes appeared. This was followed in 1778 by J. R. Forster's hefty volume *Observations . . . on Physical Geography, Natural History, and Ethic Philosophy*. Beaglehole worked out by inference the extent of Johann's contribution to his son's book.⁵⁰ He welcomed in 1971 the news, reported by Michael Hoare, that the manuscript Journal

⁴⁷B. L. Egerton, MS 2180, f. 17.

⁴⁸P. R. O. Adm. 55/108, quoted by Beaglehole, II, cxxvi-cxxvii.

⁴⁹B. L. Add. MS 27886, f. 1. Compare Cook, *A Voyage towards the South Pole, 1772-1775*, 2 vols. (London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell, 1777), I, xxxvi.

⁵⁰Beaglehole, III, cxlix-cl.

of J. R. Forster had come to light in a large collection of Forster manuscripts in the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin.⁵¹ In his last letter to me, dated 8 June 1971, three months before he died, he commented that he was looking forward to seeing the text of this manuscript comprising Forster's holograph account of the voyage, to compare it with young George's book, and that he was planning to do some detective work to resolve the following problem. In the Sandwich papers there was a large set of specimens of J. R. Forster's work which he submitted when seeking nomination for writing the history of the voyage. The text is virtually the same as George's first three chapters. For the answer to this and other Forster problems and the publication of J. R. Forster's manuscript we await Michael Hoare's edition now being prepared for the Hakluyt Society.

The Forster father and son, especially the father, came in for much criticism in England on account of their uncompromising behavior. The astronomer to the expedition, William Wales, published a riposte to Forster, *Remarks on Mr. Forster's Account of Captain Cook's last Voyage round the World* (1778), which in turn drew from George a *Reply to Mr. Wales's Remarks* (1778). Writing of George's *A Letter to the Earl of Sandwich*, in which George complained that he and his father had not been sufficiently rewarded, John Nichols, the printer commented that it "serves but to confirm our general observation, that Foreigners, however glad to court, even to servility, the patronage of England, rarely make those returns which the liberality and candour of Englishmen demand . . ."⁵² (in his patriotic fervor conveniently overlooking the contributions of other distinguished foreigners such as Dr. Solander and Dr. Sparrman!) Yet his long list of the Forster's publications in English and German indicated one type of return which the Forsters gave freely, their publication of the scientific results of the voyage.

The Forsters well deserve the revaluation of their merits now in hand. As M. Hoare has pointed out, George's essay "*Cook der Entdecker*", prefaced to his German translation of the third voyage, provides one of the more understanding assessments of Cook's character and achievements.⁵³ Hoare's recent biography of Johann Reinhold entitled *The Tactless Philosopher* (Melbourne: Hawthorne Press, 1976) ranks as a

⁵¹Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz (Berlin), MS Germ. Quart. 222-227.

⁵²John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, 9 vols. (London: Nichols, son & Bentley, 1812), III, 90-91.

⁵³M. E. Hoare, "Cook the Discoverer," an essay by Georg Foster, 1787, in *Records of the Australian Academy of Sciences*, I, No. 4 (1969), 7-16.

major contribution to the literature on this difficult but able man. Dr. W. T. Stearn likewise gives the Forsters credit for awakening Germany to an interest in geographical discovery. He sees them as an important link in the chain of events which began with Cook and Banks and their scientific retinue setting out in the *Endeavour* in 1768, and took Alexander von Humboldt to the New World in 1799.

Cook's Third Voyage (1776-1779)

For the third voyage a full journal in Cook's own hand survived, covering events up to a month before his death, and Dr. John Douglas was again to be editor. Whatever there was in the way of preliminary drafts disappeared late in 1780. Philip Stephens, the Admiralty Secretary, wrote to Douglas on 14 November 1780 that he was sending him in three parcels "Cap^t Cook's Journals Log Books, & loose Manuscripts relative to this Voyage."⁵⁴ Captain King wrote on 16 December, "I have made all the enquiries but without effect for Cap^t. Cook's loose papers, they are not at the Admiralty, M^{rs} Cook has not got them & the Clerke knows nothing of them, C. Gore is out of town but it seems unlikely that he can give any account; however on my return I will make another search."⁵⁵

Of his commission to edit the texts, Douglas wrote as follows: "1783 . . . Lord Sandwich then at y^e Head of the Admiralty, had in 1781, prevailed upon me, to undertake the Task of preparing Cap^t Cook's 3^d Voyage for the Press, I employed my spare time, this & y^e preceding Year, in that Work. The Plates not being engraved, I regulated my Progress accordingly, & began to print in July 1783. The Public never knew, how much they owe to me in this Work. The Cap^t's M.S.S. was indeed attended to accurately;⁵⁶ but I took more Liberties than I had done with his Acc^t of the second Voyage; and while I faithfully represented the facts, I was less scrupulous in cloathing them with better Stile than fell to the usual Share of the Cap^t Andersons M.S. was also a fruitful Source of important Additions, & by being perpetually before me, enabled me to draw up a much more interesting Narrative than could have been extracted from Cap^t Cook's M.S. alone. My Introduction to the Voyage, & my Notes, still added more to y^e value of the Publication. But while Justice was done to my Labors by the World

⁵⁴B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 19.

⁵⁵B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 21.

⁵⁶First drafted as "The Cap^t's M.S.S. was my Ground-work."

in general, I received no proper thanks from those whose Duty it was to take the Lead in expressing Acknowledgements for my Assistance. Lord Sandwich had been removed from the Admiralty, & Lord Howe who was there when the Voyage came out, never had the Civility to take the least Notice of me; & far from consulting me on any part of this Business, treated me with an unaccountable neglect, nay seemed to take every step that could vex and mortify me. I engaged in the Work, merely to serve M^{rs} Cook, but her Interest & Cap^t King's, seemed to be very little consulted by Lord Howe, & his *Advisers*; and the only Person who was a great gainer was the Book-seller who published the Work. He indeed made a fortune by the Sale, while y^e Representatives of Cook & King were never attended to, and forced to accept of that share of the Profits w^{ch} a *Junto* of Cap^t Cook's declar'd Enemies thought proper to allot."⁵⁷ He commented further, "This Spring [1784] I was so busy correcting the Sheets of the Voyage, that my Health suffered considerably. My Labor having happily ceased by the Publication of the work in the Summer, after my Residence in June I went to Windsor. . . ."⁵⁸

In his task as editor Douglas was assisted by Captain James King, who on the recommendation of Sir Joseph Banks was chosen to write the last part of the voyage, from the time when Captain Cook's journal ended (that is, a month before his death). The third volume of the text was therefore King's volume. The many difficulties which Douglas and King encountered in their joint task are revealed in Douglas's correspondence in the Egerton Manuscripts, which came to the British Museum in 1872. The preparation of the *Voyage* for publication was a matter of official regulation in which a number of influential people had a hand. Lord Sandwich as First Lord of the Admiralty undertook personal responsibility for the progress of the work. A committee which met at Banks's house supervised the choice of geographical names and the preparation of the maps and illustrations, although the Admiralty had the final word. When Lord Sandwich retired from office on 20 March 1782, he was succeeded on 30 March by Augustus Keppel (Viscount Keppel). Lord Keppel and Richard Howe, First Viscount Howe, alternated twice as ministries changed. Lord Sandwich, however, not only maintained his interest, but continued general supervision of the project. Acting as intermediary between Douglas and Lord Sandwich (and also Lord Keppel) was the Canon's friend and colleague, the Re-

⁵⁷B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 48–49^v.

⁵⁸B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 50^r.

verend Dr. Antony Shepherd, F.R.S., Canon of Windsor from July 1777, who had secured through Lord Sandwich's patronage in 1768 the Plumian professorship of astronomy at Cambridge. As a friend and associate of Captain Cook, Shepherd in July 1774 had a group of small islands in the New Hebrides named after him. Douglas's letter to Shepherd of 12 January 1759 reveals that it was Shepherd who had secured Douglas as editor, presumably by proposing his name to Lord Sandwich.⁵⁹

To illustrate the procedures from an example of special interest to this conference, on 20 November 1782 Douglas pleaded with Lord Sandwich for "a Reprieve of the condemned Name of King George's Sound, to be added to Nootka? . . . the World will wonder not to find it in Cap^t Cook's Voyage. There seems to be a Propriety in giving an English Name to this first Discovery of English Navigators, so far North on the West Side of America; and I think it is the only Memorial to his Majesty, which Cap^t Cook has given us, in exploring that Continent."⁶⁰ In a letter of 22 November 1782 Sandwich reported that Sir Joseph Banks had agreed "the denomination of *King Georges Sound* to be added or substituted to Nootka;" Lord Sandwich would therefore speak to Mr. Stephens "(if he consents to it on behalf of the Admiralty) to get the plate altered accordingly." He was happy that his "interposition has been of use," and offered further help.⁶¹ This explains why Roberts's General Chart is marked with both names, whereas the "Sketch of Nootka Sound" (Vol. III, pl. XXXVII, p. 279) and the chart of the northwest coast of America bear only "Nootka."

Many questions relating to place names and other issues minor and major were referred to Lord Sandwich, usually through Dr. Shepherd. The manuscripts were sent to Sandwich for perusal and approval. Thus on 9 February 1784, Lord Sandwich returned a section of the manuscript with the comment that he "should be glad to see the nautical part of the remainder as well as that which relates to the natives; as I have much curiosity to see what measures were taken to find out the passage thro' the Continent which was the principal object of the Voyage."⁶²

⁵⁹B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 64. "You first engaged me in the very laborious Task I have undertaken."

⁶⁰Sandwich Papers, quoted by Beaglehole, II, cxix.

⁶¹B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 59. Dalrymple had previously refused to agree. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 46r.

⁶²B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 141r.

The maps and engravings were a major source of disagreement between the editors and the committee whose proceedings seem to have become more arbitrary with the succession of Keppel as First Lord. Banks and Webber supervised the engraving of the drawings while Alexander Dalrymple (none other) "at Lord Sandwich's desire," had direction of the charts and coastal views, with the exception of the general chart. Under the sole direction of the Admiralty this was being prepared by Lieutenant Henry Roberts, who had served as master's mate in the *Resolution* under William Bligh. King's letters to Douglas show increasing discord between Douglas, King, and Roberts on the one hand, and Banks and Dalrymple on the other. Writing on 25 July 1782, King reported in answer to a letter from Douglas that he had waited on Sir Joseph Banks "in order to procure you an exact list of the drawings & an Impression of those already engraved; I was received coldly, perhaps owing to my having desired the engraver of the Genl map not to proceed with it till further enquiry should be made whether the original plan of it should be altered in the way it was by Mr. Dalrymple, or perhaps he expected your application should be made not thro' me." Sir Joseph then waited on Lord Keppel (King continued), and "the consequence was that his Lordship left the entire direction of the engraving of Mr. Webbers drawings as well as of the maps to him, upon which Sir Jos. summoned Mr. Roberts to lay before him the state of the Genl. map; desired him to give the drawings to him & told him that he had nothing further to do with it; as he should make what alterations in it he pleased, & be responsible for the propriety of those alterations & for its being engraved; Mr. Roberts finds himself very strangely treated by Sir Jos. & refused for the present complying with Sir Jos. request. Upon finding that it was the declared intention of Sir Jos & Mr. Dalrymple to introduce tracts & alterations in this Genl map which would rest upon Mr. Dalrymples authority only & that the motives for which, were to contradict some oppinions given by C. Cook, I begged Lord Duncannon would show Lord Keppel a few lines I wrote of the state of the publication, & that I took it for granted his Lordship would not authorise any alterations in maps without my being consulted. When I sent this to Lord Duncannon I did not know of the power that Lord Keppel had given Sir Jos. The answer I received was, that Lord Keppel could not recede from the promise he had given Sir Jos. When Mr. Roberts found that I was too insignificant to be consulted in these matters, he declared he would have nothing further to do with the map, as long as it was to be altered at the pleasure of those who had used him so ill, & who even told him, that it was not to

be considered as a map of his drawing."⁶³ King promised Roberts to intercede with Lord Keppel on his behalf, but desisted at Roberts' request; "a good & powerful friend of mine," Roberts wrote, "has taken the matter into consideration, and will no doubt use his utmost means to promote my Interest. . . ."⁶⁴

On 23 August 1782 Shepherd had a long conversation with Lord Sandwich and made no doubt of every difficulty being smoothed.⁶⁵ Shepherd's further discussion with Lord Sandwich on 25 August 1782 had to be communicated to Douglas *viva voce*. Once again he had no doubt of getting everything settled as Douglas wished.⁶⁶ On 15 September 1782 Shepherd reported that following consultations with Webber, Lord Sandwich had undertaken to obtain from Paris the supply of paper needed for printing the illustrations (which should have been ordered a year earlier).⁶⁷ Nine days later Shepherd sent the good news that Lord Sandwich "had obviated every difficulty relative to the publication and that it will now go on without any delay. Every person concerned in the affair is in good humour. . . . The Admiralty will advance the money for the Paper and it is written for—I believe L^d Sandwich will now have the entire settling the whole of this affair in every Branch and can with pleasure tell you, that he estimates Captⁿ Cooke's merits as you & I do."⁶⁸ (Such comments are significant for what they do not say. Who exactly were Cook's detractors?)

Many of the letters necessarily were concerned with the maps and engravings. No volume of discoveries can have had as much time and money expended on its illustrations as Captain Cook's third voyage, which when it finally appeared included two large maps and sixty-one engraved plates after Webber's drawings. The publication itself was delayed until 1784 because of the difficulties in securing the paper and in completing the work of design and engraving. Further, with Dalrymple dictating to Douglas and King in matters concerning the preparation of the charts and engravings, disagreements were inevitable. Dalrymple's

⁶³B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 34–35.

⁶⁴25 July 1782. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 32^r.

⁶⁵B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 39^r.

⁶⁶B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 41^r.

⁶⁷B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 45. Shepherd's letter of 9 September 1782 (f. 43) had reported: "The delay I now see will be in getting the paper from Paris, and the taking of a sufficient number of impressions, the Artists say that it cannot be done in less than a year—The paper should have been provided a year ago."

⁶⁸Letter of 24 September 1782. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 50.

association with Banks in geographical matters dated back to 1768, when Dalrymple supplied Banks with his first book: *An Account of the Discoveries made in the South Pacific Ocean previous to 1764* (printed in 1767). In 1772 the two were in active collaboration, as H. B. Carter has shown, because a copper-plate found recently in Dr. Solander's collections at the British Museum (Natural History) is engraved by John Bayly with a map of the Pacific Ocean by Dalrymple and was evidently commissioned and paid for by Banks (date of account 26 March 1772). Ten years later Banks and Dalrymple constituted a formidable alliance. Thus in a letter to Douglas of 16 September 1782 King wrote of two meetings at Mr. Stephens' respecting the general chart, reporting that "after some warm words Mr. Dalrymple at last gave up the having any concerns in it." This letter also contained "A List of the Charts & Sketches" planned for publication, with notes on the state of completion of each.⁶⁹ On 13 December 1783 King reported the results of other arguments: "At your desire Nootka sound will not be proceeded with till I give Mr. Dalrymple farther directions. I have persuaded that Gentleman to have Adventure bay engraved & some other additions; but he & Sir Jos. are determined to have their Polar map & not mine, & to have none of the Hudson bay Companies discoveries inserted saying that these things are only proper in the General Chart."⁷⁰ This shows that the "Chart of the NW Coast of America and NE Coast of Asia" was the design of Dalrymple in collaboration with Banks, and explains the omission of any interior details of North America and of the name King George's Sound. Whatever Dalrymple's faults as cartographic editor, he was responsible for one important feature of the illustrations, the inclusion of "6 plates of views of the Land intended for nautical uses."⁷¹ It is significant that these are inserted in the three volumes of text, whereas the other illustrations (asterisked in the List of the Plates) were normally bound in a separate volume, an arrangement contrary to King's wish and advice.⁷²

⁶⁹B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 46-47.

⁷⁰B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 107r.

⁷¹Letter of Banks to Douglas, 30 March 1784. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 188.

⁷²The separation of the illustrations from the text, which Nicol instructed the book-binders to follow, was determined (Nicol asserted) by the "reputable part of the trade . . . who are all of the opinion, the ornamental plates should make a Separate Volume, & who mean to do them up in that way." G. Nicol to Douglas, 14 May 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 219. King's disapproval "of anything that may tend to separate the plates from the narrative" is reported in a letter from his brother Walter King to Douglas in May 1784. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 220r.

Douglas had also to deal with a self-appointed collaborator in the person of Thomas Pennant, the naturalist and traveller. Pennant asked to see the texts, offered to contribute zoological comments, and sought to use the material in his forthcoming *Arctic Zoology*, whose publication in 1784 he proposed to delay until he had seen the whole of Cook's voyage, as his book would otherwise come out "hurried & imperfect."⁷³ King, whose text was mainly concerned, could see no objection to Pennant having the proof sheets.⁷⁴ He considered Pennant's contribution was "a real addition" to the zoological part of the work; and also it had the advantage of bringing volume III up to 400 pages (in fact 558 pages).⁷⁵ Pennant's participation in the enterprise, however, caused further friction with Banks. On 10 February 1784, Pennant wrote, "Both Sir J. Banks & Mr Dalrymple denied to me any knowledge of the drawings. But this I speak in confidence. I am sure they will not be forth coming if my name is used."⁷⁶ Again, on 9 May 1784: "I hope when you made enquiry after the mountainous Views of Sir Joseph Banks that my name was not mentioned. I fear he thinks me considerable enough to be an object of his jealousy: & I hear that there is now a certain murmuring. As I wish to live peaceably with him I would not give even a distant cause under the rose, I fear that the loose sheets I drew up for the use of Capt'n King might have got by mistake to Soho Square."⁷⁷

Banks's sensitivities may explain an apparent restraint in the acknowledgment of Pennant's help in "enriching the third volume with references to his *Arctic Zoology* . . ." and in communicating some manuscript accounts of Russian discoveries.⁷⁸ Likewise Pennant does not refer in his *Arctic Zoology* to the special facilities granted him by Douglas and King for consulting their as yet unpublished materials. His concern that Cook's *Voyage* should appear first ensured that he could refer to the published work. This apparent discretion may explain why Pennant's role in the publication of Cook's third voyage and the pub-

⁷³Letter of 25 April 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180 f. 208r; also letter of 11 November 1783, f. 92.

⁷⁴Letter of 17 February 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 151r.

⁷⁵Letter of 14 January 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 116r.

⁷⁶B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 142r.

⁷⁷B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 212.

⁷⁸James Cook, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean*, 2 vols. (London: G. Nicol and T. Cadell, 1784), I, lxxxiv-lxxxv.

licizing of its zoological discoveries has been underestimated.⁷⁹ In fact the zoological comments on the northern discoveries were Pennant's, and he made corrections for the second edition.⁸⁰ He saw his *Arctic Zoology* as "supplemental" to Cook's *Voyage*, and for this reason had a number of copies issued at the same size.⁸¹ The fourteen volumes of his *Outlines of the Globe* were also to be this size.⁸² His literary device of taking "imaginary tours"⁸³ gave a framework to the *Arctic Geographer*, as his comment to Douglas (26 March 1784) well illustrates: "I have made *my* voyage along the coast of Sibiria, & must visit Kamtschatka first before I cross over to meet you at Cape Blanco; after which I shall attend you along the coast of America through Bering's Streights till you are forced back by the ice, which will be no sort of impediment to me in my air Balloon: I shall proceed directly by the mouth of the Copper river . . ." ⁸⁴

Pennant's Introduction to his *Arctic Zoology*, entitled "Of the Arctic World", includes long sections on Cook's voyage which provide the earliest independent geographical assessment of Cook's discoveries. Major issues of natural philosophy are discussed, as follows: "The late voyage of the illustrious Cook has reduced the probable conjectures of philosophers into certainty. He has provided that the limits of the Old and New World approach within thirteen leagues of each other . . . every other system of the population of the New World is now overthrown. The conjectures of the learned, respecting the vicinity of the Old and New are now, by the discoveries of our great navigator, lost in conviction . . . the real place of migration is uncontrovertably pointed out."⁸⁵ Of special interest among the illustrations is the engraving "Tomahawk & Bow" (plate VI, p. cxliv), illustrating "that most terrific Tomahawk of Nootka Sound, called the *Taaweesh*, or *Tsuskeeah*," and

⁷⁹Thus Beaglehole, I, cciii, refers to the additions from Pennant and others as "padding." As noted above, King did not welcome the enlargement of his volume. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 116^r.

⁸⁰Pennant's corrections are set out in his letters of 3 and 12 July 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 242^r and 243^{r-v}.

⁸¹Letter of Pennant to Douglas, 16 November 1783, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 93^v-94^r.

⁸²Thomas Pennant, *The Literary Life of the late Thomas Pennant, Esq.* (London: B. & J. White and R. Faulder, 1793), p. 41.

⁸³Pennant, p. 40.

⁸⁴B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 185.

⁸⁵Thomas Pennant, *Arctic Zoology* (London: H. Hughes, 1784), pp. clxvi-clxvii.

a small bow made of bone also from Nootka. The bow which was in the British Museum, Pennant describes in a letter, "On it is the whole chasse of the savages so well done that I have every animal. Doct Solander sayed it should be engraved."⁸⁶ Furthermore, in his *Supplement to the Arctic Zoology*, (1787), Pennant commented that he had been reproached for not providing a map with the *Arctic Zoology*. He now supplied two, engraved by William Palmer who had engraved those in Cook's third *Voyage*. For Pennant's second map, covering the north Pacific, the Arctic Ocean, and adjoining continents of North America and Asia, he acknowledged particularly, "an admirable map of the American and Asiatic part, formed by the much-lamented, the late Captain James King." This is the map which Dalrymple and Banks had refused to use for their chart of the North Pacific.

Pennant's material reward for his collaboration comprised gifts of the volume and of the prints. When the *Voyage* came out he hastened to order another set: "on the strength of a promise from Mr Stephens & a present from him of the prints of the preceding voyage I had half hung a room with them, therefore am under a necessity of getting this work."⁸⁷

The many editorial concerns of Douglas and King are revealed day by day in the course of Douglas's correspondence. King asks Douglas to correct the estimate of Cook's discoveries on the North American coast from 4,000 to 3,500 miles, as more accurately estimated by Roberts.⁸⁸ He requests that if Douglas "should have any learned geographer in your eye," he would recommend Roberts to him "to settle the names of Oceans Seas Gulfs straits &c &c &c according to some fixt rule."⁸⁹ King confirms that the passage on the "mutinous refusal to drink the sugar cane beer" was not erased "in Capt Clerkes time but after C. Gore got possession of the M.S."⁹⁰ Webber provides an account of his visit to Nootka Sound.⁹¹ From Samuel Wegg, F.R.S., Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company, Douglas obtains the journals and maps of Samuel

⁸⁶Letter of 27 January 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 128^v in which Pennant describes the bow as being "from George Sound," c. f. the more general attribution in his *Arctic Zoology*, I, p. sig. A4^r.

⁸⁷Letter of 3 July 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 242.

⁸⁸Letter of 1 February 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 135^r.

⁸⁹Letter of 17 February 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 151^r.

⁹⁰Letter of 27 February 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 163^r.

⁹¹Letter of 31 December 1783, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 112-113. Printed by Beaglehole, I, 319-320, note.

Hearne's expedition to northwest America.⁹² He was to give the first account of Hearne's discoveries to the world; and Roberts used Hearne's map for compiling his General Chart. The argument as to whether the inhabitants of the Tonga (Friendly) Islands sang in parts drawn from a joint memorandum from Lord Sandwich and Dr. Charles Burney, which left the matter undecided, and this Douglas was to print.⁹³ Mrs. Cook makes a brief and anguished appearance in a letter of 19 June 1782, writing of "promising to set down what Particulars I knew of my late dear Husband . . . but I am not able to write [a] single word upon so distressing a Subject."⁹⁴

Certain sensibilities had also to be taken into account. Douglas tactfully agreed to the request from Sir Hugh Palliser, Comptroller of the Navy, to omit Cook's critical remarks about the cordage: "it is well known [wrote Palliser, 5 March 1784] that there is no better Cordage than what is made in the King's Yards . . . The part propos'd to be omitted seems to convey a complaint of abuse or mismanagement in the Yards which is improper in Cap^t Cook in such a Work, besides he errs . . . It would require a long note to explain Cap^t Cook's Error it being out of his line."⁹⁵ King handled the diplomatic niceties of the affair of the Polish Baron Beniowski, who was then in England: "I find that the Baron Beniowski is likely to have too strong a party in England to make it prudent for me to get into a controversy with him. If we had him on the banks of the Bolchoireka we should shew him the difference." He agreed to an innocuous rewording which referred to an "*exiled polish officer*" adding, "If you could get Beniowsky's real name, country, or situation in Kamtschatka from himself, I should like much to have it added as a note."⁹⁶ Douglas had even offered to visit that enigmatic individual, who was, from Coxe's account (wrote King) "a curiosity well worth seeing."

⁹²B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 214^r. Pennant on 26 March 1784 had recommended Douglas to secure Hearne's map, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 185^v-186^r.

⁹³Memorandum forwarded by King, 12 February 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 145-146, also 149. A letter of 21 February 1784 from King gives further information. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 155: "I agree with you that the musical note would have come more properly at the friendly islands." In fact, King had instructed "Insert Book 5, Chapt. 7, page 26, in parts" and so it appeared in the context of the music of the Sandwich Islands. *Voyage*, III, 143-144.

⁹⁴B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 28. This concerned an inquiry from a Mr. Farquharson.

⁹⁵B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 171.

⁹⁶Letter of 15 March 1784. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 179.^r Earlier letters of 8 and 13 March 1784 also relate. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 173, 177.

As with other assignments as litterateur, Douglas had undertaken the work of editor on condition that his anonymity be preserved. He was outraged when the *Morning Chronicle* of 18 January 1783 came out with an extraordinary and ill-natured report: "It is unfortunate for this country, that she is never so happy in the choice of her Navigators, as France," the writer began, comparing the "excellent exotick accounts of Condamine, Bellin, Bougainville, &c, to Anson and Cook, who had to have Benjamin Robbins [*sic*], Hawkesworth and Dr. Douglas to edit their journals. Surely these Marine Gentlemen's narrative must have been better told by themselves than by those uninterested in their scenes of pleasure and distress." This observation is certainly verified in Parkinson's "Narrative..." Writing the following day to his friend William Strahan the printer, Douglas expostulated: "I suppose you have read ... the very strange Paragraph in which I am announced to the Public as employed in *finishing grammatically* Cap^t Cook's Voyage. After all my Care & Study to have my Name kept back, it equally mortifies & surprises me, to be thus made the sport of News Papers." He was sorry that the printer and editor Mr. W. Woodfall "should have given his Sanction to such a heap of inconsistent Abuse. It begins with insinuating that Cap^t Cook was unfit for the Service to w^{ch} he was appointed. It soon after speaks of Dr. Hawksworth as having *tarnished* his Journal, & then it proceeds to suppose him incapable of writing a Journal, by saying I had *digested* that of his former Voyage & am now *finishing* that of the last."⁹⁷ Asking Strahan to enquire after the source of information, Douglas commented, "It is calculated to have some dirty purpose."

What was behind the attack remains unknown. A few days earlier Douglas had received the disquieting news that Thomas Cadell had been dropped as publisher, and in a letter to Shepherd of 12 January 1783 Douglas offered his resignation. "I really begin to suspect that it will be agreeable, that I should offer to resign, in order to prevent my being formally dismissed."⁹⁸ He probably never sent this letter (which we find preserved in his own correspondence), as William Strahan (printer for the third *Voyage* and joint publisher with Cadell for the second) reported in a letter of 14 January that Cadell's name would be retained (after Nicol's), but George Nicol was to have the sole management and the profit of the publication.⁹⁹ Friends of Banks (of unknown

⁹⁷B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 68.

⁹⁸B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 64.

⁹⁹B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 66.

identity) were party to the arrangement, and Banks gave the instructions but was stated not to be personally responsible: "it was not by the interference of Sir Joseph." Whether the newspaper attack was connected with this other affair remains unknown.

The last anxious weeks before publication in 1784 are fully documented by letters to and fro. Publication day was fixed for 4 June 1784, the King's birthday. Webber reported to King on 6 March 1784 that on Banks's orders he had had to tell the engravers "whatever plate was not finished this month must be laid aside."¹⁰⁰ On 2 June, congratulating Douglas on his "deliverance," Nicol reminded him that he had only eight days (exclusive of Sunday) for finishing the work, and believed that "no similar Business was ever undertaken, in double the time."¹⁰¹ The Earl of Hardwicke, well-known for what was teasingly called his "spite against the South Sea" (as Daniel Wray called it,¹⁰²) had written in May from Bath, "I have ordered Cadel to send me Cooks Voyage when it comes out, but then I bid *Adieu* to those Discoverys, the Denouement is too melancholy."¹⁰³ On 14 June, "I am possessed of Cap^t Cookes last Voyage, for w^{ch} the Public is much indebted to the *Anonymous but Public Spirited Editor*. I do not wonder, that the Plates are first looked over, as they are the best performed of any annexed to the Discoverys of that unfortunate Officer. I hope yr Great Friend at Windsor will take yr laudable Labors into his Serious Consideration before the Reward may have lost its Flavor & Merit."¹⁰⁴ The King was indeed appreciative, as a letter from Nicol (17 July 1784) reveals: "When I had the honour of seeing the King on Thursday last, I was happy to hear his Majesty heartily joining the general Voice, (which is so justly loud) in praise of the Introduction to the Voyage, & the Merits of the Editorship."¹⁰⁵

By that time a second edition was in preparation, for the first had been sold out, it is said, in three days. The second was entrusted by the Admiralty to their own stationers (Laurence and Winchester) at the recommendation of Lord Howe, and also (it was believed) of Sir Joseph

¹⁰⁰Letter from King to Douglas, 8 March 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 173^v. This order was made despite delays for paper.

¹⁰¹B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 233.

¹⁰²Nichols, *Illustrations*, I, 140.

¹⁰³B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 224.

¹⁰⁴B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 234.

¹⁰⁵B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 247^v.

Banks, and Mr. Hughes was recommended by the admiralty as printer,¹⁰⁶ to the disappointment of Strahan. These new arrangements occasioned cryptic comments, and presumably were one of the reasons for Douglas's complaint about the junta of Captain Cook's declared enemies. Who were these men, besides Lord Howe, who evidently was considered one? Are they to be identified with some of those who on 28 July 1785 determined the division of the profits arising from "the Sale of Capt^a Cook's last voyage; agreed in the Presence of Lord Sandwich, Lord Howe, Sir Joseph Banks, and M. Stephens?"¹⁰⁷

Another awkward issue arose from criticism of King's editorial work. In a letter from Christ's Hospital, 17 July 1784, William Wales, who was entrusted with the revision of the second edition, informed Douglas that "some cruel, and, I believe, unjust reports have been propagated relating to the 3^d or Capt. King's vol. of that work. These reports represent that Vol. as a mere piece of book-making; and that it is principally made up of scraps from Pennant's Arctic Zoology, and Krachenmicow's Hist. of Kamtchatka. And pains have been taken . . . to get these suggestions disseminated in the Monthly publications . . . it will not be difficult to guess where these reports originate."¹⁰⁸ Wales thought that King should know of the reports unless he was too ill. King, who had gone to Nice for his health, was in the last months of consumption. He died there on 16 November 1784 at the age of 34.¹⁰⁹

The disappearance of "the running Journal" which King, while he commanded the *Discovery*, wrote as far as the Cape of Good Hope, made it difficult to Beaglehole fully to assess King's skills as an editor.¹¹⁰ The major recent discovery concerning the third voyage has been the recovery of this journal. Reference O.D. 279 MCL 15, it was run to earth by Commander Andrew David in 1972-73 in the Sailing Directions archives of the Hydrographic Department. The Journal has the immediacy of the on-the-spot report, as opposed to the flowing, man-

¹⁰⁶Letter of Andrew Strahan (son of William) to Douglas, 1 July 1784. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 240. Nicol had declined any concern in the printing. The printer chosen was Henry Hughes.

¹⁰⁷Memorandum in the hands of Banks. Beaglehole I, cc.

¹⁰⁸B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 251.

¹⁰⁹Douglas received the news in a letter of 30 November 1784 from James's brother, E. King. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 111.

¹¹⁰Notes by King inserted at the beginning of his *Log and Proceedings*, Adm. 55/116 refer to this journal, and are printed by Beaglehole, I, clxxix, clxxxii. On King's editing and the disappearance of his journal, see Beaglehole, I, clxxii, cciii.

nered prose of the printed version. I am now editing this Journal for publication by the Hakluyt Society and will append to it Douglas's correspondence, as documentation for the publication of the third Voyage.¹¹¹

As the extracts from the letters show, some questions remain to be answered. For example, half the profits from the sales of the third voyage were allocated to Captain Cook's family, a quarter to the executors of Captain King, for his heirs, one-eighth to the legal representatives of Captain Clerke, one-eighth to William Bligh, after one hundred guineas were deducted for the use of Anderson's executors.¹¹² What recompense then did Douglas receive? Whatever he had expected in the way of attention (he had received instead "unaccountable neglect"), it was presumably not monetary reward, but notice in the way of preferment. As Lord Hardwicke commented, his "Great Friend at Windsor" should be mindful of his hard labors and accomplishment and Hardwicke's recommendation on his behalf did receive in January 1785 an encouraging reply from the King. Douglas himself by 1786 had almost given up hope ("all my friends are dead," he told Boswell, who replied "no Doctor your best friend is alive, yourself, your own merit"). In September 1787 he obtained his due reward with appointment to the see of Carlisle, and gained also in January 1788 the deanery of Windsor. In 1788 he was assisting James Bruce in the preparation of his *Travels in Abyssinia*. In 1791 the bishopric of Salisbury was unexpectedly offered him in exchange for Carlisle, and he happily returned to his circles in southern England, his ambitions now fulfilled.¹¹³

Secondly, there are questions relating to the work on the engravings, for which Douglas's correspondence ranks as an important source. What payment did Webber receive for his services in supervising the engravings for publications? On the voyage he was to receive 100 guineas a year as his salary, but the beneficiaries from the publication of the third *Voyage* were restricted to the officers or their heirs and executors. Webber went on to publish sixteen of his drawings as colored aquatints. A set of these is bound up with the volume of plates in

¹¹¹Referring to the difficulties and delays over the production of the volumes, Beaglehole writes: "Some of these could be documented, though this is not the place." I, cciv. He cited mainly those documents which referred to the preparation of the second *Voyage* for publication, and those which dealt with issues relating to events of the third *Voyage*.

¹¹²Beaglehole, I, cc. note.

¹¹³William Macdonald, *Select Works of the Right Reverend John Douglas . . . with a biographical memoir* (Salisbury, s.n., 1820), pp. 77-80.

Banks's copy of the plates of the third *Voyage*, pressmark BL 1899. n.1., and another set is in King George III's Topographical Collections pressmark K. Top. cxvi. 68.7 tab 74. An unrecorded collection of fourteen ethnographical and natural history drawings relating to the second and third voyages (including drawings by Webber) was recently discovered and on exhibition in London.¹¹⁴ Aquatints from his work are also in the King's Topographical Collection, K. Top cxvi. 69-71.

Other questions relate to the maps and charts. First there is Bligh's accusation that "None of the Maps and Charts in this publication are from the original drawings of Lieut. Henry Roberts, he did no more than copy the original ones from Captain Cook who besides myself was the only person that surveyed and laid the Coast down, in the *Resolution*. Every Plan & Chart from C. Cook's death are exact Copies of my Works."¹¹⁵ This complaint seems to have been well-founded, although Bligh did benefit financially from the publication. (Also what was there behind Bligh's acrimonious comments on King, otherwise so well regarded?¹¹⁶)

I must also report that Commander Andrew David has found in the Hydrographic Department a number of charts and views which were not known when R. A. Skelton and Beaglehole were preparing their lists. These relate to the third voyage and include a sketch survey of Prata Reef by Edward Riou and a survey (possibly by Bligh) of the coast of Japan drawn by Henry Roberts, which differs from the chart published in the third *Voyage*, volume III. A chart of the Sandwich Islands by Edward Riou which has been destroyed indicates that Riou also undertook original survey. The relationship between Bayly's maps and Bligh's has also to be established. Bayly's observations and charts were consulted by those preparing the third *Voyage*, and are referred to in critical tones. Some of his charts have come to rest in Vancouver Maritime Museum. Of interest also are the large volumes of charts from Banks's collections, with their Pacific and world maps which record Cook's voyages and those which followed, pressmark Maps 181.m.1.

¹¹⁴These and other drawings are being studied by Rüdiger Joppien in his work of collaboration with Bernard Smith, who is preparing the catalogue of drawings and paintings done on Cook's voyages. Details of exhibition as follows: Drawings from Captain Cook's Voyages. An unrecorded collection of fourteen ethnographical and natural history drawings relating to the second and third voyages. Hartnoll & Eyre Ltd., 13 September to 1 October 1976. Catalogue by Rüdiger Joppien.

¹¹⁵Beaglehole, I, lxxviii, ccxv-ccxvi.

¹¹⁶Beaglehole, I, lxxviii. R. T. Gould, "Bligh's notes on Cook's last voyage," *Mariner's Mirror* 14 (1928), 371-385.

(transferred from 1735.i.14.). An appendix on the various charts to be added to the Cook corpus will be included in my Hakluyt Society volume.

A New World Revealed

The trials and tribulations of the editors were drama of a different order from the heroic and desperate events of the voyage itself. Yet the publication of the third voyage was an achievement remarkable of its kind, and a fitting memorial to Captain Cook. Through the pages so devotedly written, checked, and rechecked by Douglas and by King, Cook's countrymen caught an impressive glimpse of that "new world, such as no European could have figured in his own Imagination." The engravings after Webber, with those of Buchan and Parkinson for the first voyage and of Hodges for the second, gave Europeans a visual impression of the South Seas and north Pacific shores with their exotic inhabitants. Webber's and Hodge's engravings were to form the decor for John O'Keefe's pantomime, *Omai: or a Trip Round the World*, first performed on 2 December 1785, and hailed as a great success. Its French counterpart *La Mort du Capitaine Cook*, set at Hawaii, opened in Paris in October 1788, and an English version was put on at Covent Garden in 1789, with other productions in the provinces. There was no decline in interest as the years passed by. In 1803 the "Otaheite and South Sea Rooms" of the British Museum could still be described as one of the sights of London,¹¹⁷ while the Leverian's Museum's Sandwich Room provided a spectacular display of Pacific culture.

Two hundred years later the activities of the bicentennial, from 1968 until 1979-1980, have sought to provide a fuller and more authentic picture of the new world, which in the 1780s and 1790s was only partially revealed and was distorted by the mannerisms of the time. The volumes of text give the immediacy which editing wrote out of the original *Voyages*. General exhibitions have been held in the National Maritime Museum, the British Museum (to commemorate Captain Cook's first voyage, 1968), the Australian Museum (1970), the Mitchell and Dixson Galleries of the Library of New South Wales ("The Opening of the Pacific," 1970); and more specialized ones, such as "No Sort of Iron" (New Zealand, 1969). These have all sought to give the impression of what it was like to be with Cook on his voyages, to see

¹¹⁷James Malcolm, *Londinium Redivivum*, 4 vols. (London: J. Nichols and Son, 1802-1807), II, 520-531.

with his eyes, and to interpret in the light of modern scientific knowledge. The British Museum (Natural History) has revealed the wealth of botanical and zoological material brought home, of which so little was seen by the eighteenth-century European. Among relatively recent discoveries is the male figure, a sorcerer's familiar spirit, found wrapped inside the head of the Chief Mourner's dress brought home from Tahiti. This figure was on display for the first time in the British Museum exhibition of 1968. The recovery of the cannon from the Great Barrier Reef in January 1969 by an expedition of the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences added a suitable bicentennial footnote to one of the most dramatic moments of the first voyage.

Various of the exhibitions have included sections on the sequel to the voyages which brought about the European settlement of new territories in the Pacific, and which eventually destroyed the South Sea paradise which had delighted the European intellectual of the 1780s. There was a certain irony in the fact that Banks and Solander dried their botanical specimens in the proof sheets of *Paradise Lost*!¹¹⁸ For the third voyage, an irony of another kind may be recorded; in the Deptford Collection of Prints (BL 578.m.11no. 91), "The Discovery, convict ship (lying at Deptford). The Vessel which accompanied Capt. Cook on his last Voyage. Drawn & Etched by Edw. W. Cooke, 1828. London, 1829." As a testimonial to Cook's great gifts as a seaman and leader of men, there was the record of later achievements of Cook's men: "What officers you are, *you men of Captain Cook*."¹¹⁹

Reenactments on the spot have supplied the equivalent of the eighteenth-century pantomime and ballet. One of the most notable was the arrival of *Endeavour II* at Botany Bay, in the presence of H.M. the Queen on 29 April 1970. A few weeks earlier, on 20 March at Government House, Wellington, the Queen had conferred on John Beaglehole the O.M. [Order of Merit] and he thus became the successor to Rutherford as the second New Zealander O.M. Other commemorative occasions included a program of readings at the National Portrait Gallery on 11 July 1969 (which John Beaglehole was able to attend).¹²⁰ It ended

¹¹⁸Reported by W. T. Stearn. The sheets were lent to the British Museum exhibition of 1968. Catalogue 26.

¹¹⁹Charlotte Barrett, ed., *Diary and Letters of Madam d'Arblay, 1778-1840*, 6 vols. (New York: Macmillan Co., 1904-1905), IV, 378. William Windham's words to James Burney.

¹²⁰Devised by Helen Wallis, produced by Peter Orr, read by Gary Watson and Dennis McCarthy, performed in front of Webber's portrait of Cook.

with what must be one of the most moving tributes to Captain Cook, the reminiscences of an old Maori Te Horeta at Whitianga, New Zealand, who recalled meeting Captain Cook many years before in November 1769, at Mercury Bay: "In the days long past, when I was a very little boy, a vessel came to Whitianga . . . There was one supreme man in that ship. We knew that he was Lord of the whole by his perfect gentlemanly and noble demeanour. He seldom spoke, but some of the goblins [the small boy thought the seamen must be goblins] spoke much. But this man did not utter many words: all that he did was to handle our mats and hold our spears . . . He was a very good man and came to us . . . patted our cheeks and gently touched our heads . . . My companions said 'this is the chief which is proved by his kindness to us.'" And Te Horeta would repeat the old Maori proverb: "A *rang-atira*—a nobleman—cannot be lost in a crowd."¹²¹

DR. HELEN WALLIS is presently Map Librarian of the British Library, formerly Deputy Keeper in charge of the Map Room at the British Museum. Pacific exploration has been one of her special fields of research dating back to work for her doctorate on "The Exploration of the South Seas, 1519–1644." Her edition of *Carteret's Voyage round the World* in two volumes was published by the Hackluyt Society in 1965. In 1968, she organized the Bicentenary exhibition on Captain Cook's first voyage on display in the King's Library of the British Museum. She is now a member of the committee organizing the joint British Museum-British Library exhibition on Captain Cook and the South Sea to be held in the Museum of Mankind, February to November, 1979. Other activities include Chairmanship of the Commission on the History of Cartography of the International Cartographic Association. She is a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London.

¹²¹John White, *Ancient History of the Maori* (Wellington: G. Didsbury, 1887), pp. 121, 129. This is an abbreviated version as given by Beaglehole, "On the character of Captain James Cook," *Geographical Journal*, 122 (1956), 429.

COOK STUDIES: WHITHER NOW?

by Michael E. Hoare

At the end of April 1978, exactly two hundred years after Captain James Cook left Nootka Sound, Vancouver Island, British Columbia, to make northwards towards Alaska and Bering Strait, over 450 scholars from the complete spectrum of disciplines; editors, secretaries of societies, museum people, Cook devotees, historians, natural historians, medical men, cartographers, geographers, anthropologists, and others from the southern and northern hemispheres foregathered at Simon Fraser University in greater Vancouver on the lower mainland of British Columbia to consider "Captain Cook's Life and Times" in four days of conference, exchanges, excursions, celebrations and feasting such as would rival any Polynesian festivity in the Pacific. They had come to celebrate the bicentenary of that Nootka landfall, to focus on Cook's third voyage (1776-1780) but also, in the words of the conference pre-program, "as people from throughout the world who are interested in all three voyages and the scientific discoveries they produced." More was indeed foretold:

It [the Conference] will offer a unique opportunity for scholars from a number of disciplines to discuss new research and reconsider earlier assessments and perspectives.

And further:

The scientific and artistic impact of Cook's voyages have a universal significance. The remarkable contributions to human knowledge resulting from Cook's voyages have affected many fields of science including navigation, botany, history, geography, medicine etc. and continue to be significant to the present day.¹

It was an ambitious, a significant conference: for Pacific studies it was also a seminal series of symposia, both in intent and results. Hitherto only the expected spate of more popular journalistic reports, some good, most bad, has appeared to review the work and achievements of this conference. Most of this reporting has not, however, overlooked the

¹Simon Fraser University, *Captain James Cook and His Times: International and Interdisciplinary Conference* (Vancouver, B.C.), pp. 1-2. I am grateful to all colleagues at this conference for the free exchange and discussion which made this paper, a very personal view, possible.

fact that this was a gathering of review: the reviewing of Cook and his work.² It was also, too, more than anything else a critical re-examination of the massive scholarship of the one man, the late Professor John Cawte Beaglehole, who has made Cook's and most of his companions' manuscript original observations on the Pacific (and elsewhere) available to succeeding grateful generations of scholars. One is reminded here of the dedication by Douglas L. Oliver in his monumental *Ancient Tahitian Society* (Honolulu, 1974) to Kenneth Emory, Raymond Firth and the late John Beaglehole who, wrote Oliver, "have infused new life into the study of Polynesian culture." I was reminded, too, at the beginning of these important Cook proceedings of the question put to me in Dunedin in June 1977 by one of our eminent and emeritus New Zealand professors on the occasion of the 1977 Hocken Lecture: "Is there anything new to say about Cook after Beaglehole?" On that occasion, I think, we could show that there were new directions in Cook Studies which we needed to follow post-Beaglehole.³ After Vancouver and Simon Fraser in April 1978 there is no doubt.

It is not my brief here to analyze exhaustively each of the twenty-three papers formally read (in summary) or any of the four tabled at the Vancouver Conference. Some ten or one dozen of those papers will appear in the important forthcoming book of selected essays to be edited by Dr. Robin Fisher and Dr. Hugh Johnston of the Department of History at Simon Fraser University (hereafter SFU).⁴ It was my privilege, however, to be asked to deliver the first Conference paper⁵ and to attempt in ten minutes (a totally inadequate time) a summary of the Conference. Since the former was retrospective and suggestive of "revision" in regard to the scholarship of J. C. Beaglehole, and the latter was able to draw upon the stimulus of ideas and discussion (much of the best of it coming from the floor!) I intend here simply to suggest some of the new research and directions which Cook Studies—particularly as they relate to the Pacific—may take or are taking. The op-

²See, for example, "Captain Cook Renown May Be Overdone," *Los Angeles Times*, 10 May 1978 and Alan Merridew, "Captain Cook Controversy on the Boil," *Sydney Bulletin*, 23 May 1978, pp. 19-20.

³Michael E. Hoare, *In the Steps of Beaglehole: Cook Researches Past and Prospect* (Dunedin, 1977).

⁴This volume goes to press in September 1978 and should be speedily available early in 1979 to Cook scholars as one example of the culmination over ten years of bicentenary research. The full papers have been issued in unedited original duplicated form in three volumes by SFU University. These are referred to hereafter as SFU Papers.

⁵Michael E. Hoare, "Two Centuries' Perceptions of James Cook: George Foster to Beaglehole," SFU Papers, I, 33 pp.

portunity to see some of the SFU Vancouver papers published in this issue of *Pacific Studies* will be especially welcome to students of the Pacific and of Cook as well as to the participants in the Vancouver Conference.

The SFU organizers had divided the offerings into seven very full sessions in which they sought to give full play to the influence of Cook's voyages on both the European and Pacific indigenous activities of the second three decades of the eighteenth century and later. One was reminded at the outset of George Forster's (Cook's assistant naturalist on the second voyage) prophesy of 1787 in his farseeing essay "*Cook der Entdecker*:"

What Cook has added to the mass of our knowledge is such that it will strike deep roots and have the most decisive influence on the activities of men. . . . Only our present century could satisfy Cook's burning ambition by putting resources at his disposal, thus enabling him to become a discoverer, and Cook alone could come up to the expectations of his times.⁶

There was, as with any humanly devised classification, inevitably some overlap in the taxonomy of the Cook scholarship so divided. Our Linnean contrived or artificial system, however, soon evolved into something more natural—and exciting.

The first session on "Implications of Cook's Voyages" left us in no doubt of two things: that revision of Beaglehole—and thus Cook—would be a major conference theme and that, as befitted the venue—albeit at the "back door," so to speak—Canada had some rightful claim to Cook as a "hero."⁷ Professor Glyndwr Williams of Queen Mary College, London, in his paper raised serious doubts about Cook's credibility as a reliable cartographer on the third voyage, especially in Alaskan-Russian waters.⁸ Williams did not deny Cook's great achievements of the first two, mainly South Pacific navigations: his principal contention was that Cook seemed to have lost his healthy scepticism towards previous theoretical cartographers of the North Pacific and that he did not show the critical discernment and judgments of former years after July 1776. Ear-

⁶The translation is by Dr. Gerda Bell of Wellington for the forthcoming English edition of G. Forster's essay, *Cook the Discoverer* . . . , ed. M. E. Hoare (Wellington, at press).

⁷Barry Gough, "James Cook and Canada: A Chapter in the Importance of the Sea in Canadian History," SFU Papers, I, 16 pp.

⁸Glyndwr Williams, "Myth and Reality: James Cook and the Theoretical Geography of Northwest America," SFU Papers, I, 20 pp.

lier Cook had been looking for "the looming haystack of a southern continent" but on the third voyage he "was searching for the slim needle of a Northwest Passage."⁹ Williams presented careful and ample documentary and original cartographical evidence to back up his strictures on "Cook's suspension of belief, and his evident failure to subject the maps in front of him to critical scrutiny."¹⁰ But no one could deny that Cook did provide the first recognizable shape and position for the North Pacific littorals.

There was a hint emerging here that, for the wrong reasons, theoretical and practical, Cook achieved some undeniable degree of success. Cook wrote (or perhaps substantially wrote) his own instructions for the third voyage; relied too heavily upon previous cartographical theorists and hence spent too long exploring for myths and phantoms. And the phantoms may have proved fatal. From this first session (which included my own retrospective and heretical piece) we became aware of skeletons lurking in both Beagleholean and Cookian cupboards. Soon they would put on frail flesh!

Each paper-presentation-session was followed by open discussion. The first session was chaired by Dr. Timothy Beaglehole, the historian Indilogist son of J. C. Beaglehole and editor of his father's last *magnum opus*, *Life of Captain James Cook* (London, 1974). Dr. Beaglehole gave a résumé of his father's growth of interest in and commitment to Cook studies which arose out of the writing of his (J. C. Beaglehole's) *The Exploration of the Pacific* (London, 1934).¹¹ In the first session discussion Dr. Eric McCormick of Auckland University recalled at some length his association with J. C. Beaglehole as a younger colleague in New Zealand. Beaglehole, he revealed, had only thought of getting out of New Zealand early in his academic career and by being away researching in London in 1924-26, he "discovered New Zealand." Beaglehole's education had been literary in the English tradition: things could be seen therefore sometimes in terms of heroes and villains. This, suggested McCormick, might account for Beaglehole's interpretations of Cook and his times. Several points were made in defense of Beaglehole—if that critical, generous scholar needs defending!—before Professor Williams had his paper subjected to the searching scrutiny of hydrographical historians and historical hydrographers which resolved into a

⁹Williams, p. 1.

¹⁰Williams, p. 14.

¹¹I have relied on my own conference notes and occasionally upon those of my friend and colleague, Dr. Peter J. P. Whitehead of London, in recalling the discussion.

learned exchange on Russian-Alaska-Bering Straits theoretical geography.

An earnest of chauvinistic and "nationalistic" things to come emerged in this discussion as various experts commented critically on the variable policies of different late eighteenth-century governments towards publishing maps of their servants' discoveries. Dr. James R. Gibson of York University, Ontario, commented that the Russians never allowed cartographers (even their own) full access to the requisite maps and Dr. Christon I. Archer of the University of Calgary noted that it was not only Spanish government policy deliberately not to publish maps but also to maintain an excellent network of spies. Dr. Alan Frost of Latrobe University, Melbourne, Australia, reminded us of the secrecy surrounding European claims to New Holland and the adjacent islands.

It was Dr. Helen Wallis of the British Library who brought the discussion into fine perspective by citing the Dutch desire to control trade in the Indies and South and their envy of the French hydrographic service of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. She reminded us, too, of Alexander Dalrymple's immense achievement in delving successfully into and publishing foreign (especially Spanish) exploration archives. Cook's "primary object" of the third voyage was to find the Northwest Passage, said Dr. Wallis, and she evidenced the important correspondence between the Earl of Sandwich and Canon John Douglas, Cook's second and third voyage editor, to confirm this contention.

The historian, most were agreed, needed commitment—here one was reminded personally of the work of the Australian Sir Keith Hancock and the tragic Frenchman Marc Bloch in this regard¹²—to face and interpret his subject. Slowly we were progressing collectively to the view that Cook, our hero, could (or might) make mistakes and that Beaglehole, his Boswell, might need some revision in the light of new research and interpretations. Not all, however, would subscribe to the view. Dr. William Stearn, the eminent botanist of London, remarked that Banks could not be forgiven by Beaglehole for his immense wealth but, surprisingly I thought, Stearn could not bring himself to contemplate sympathetically the "blaggard" botanist of the second voyage, Johann Reinhold Forster, either as *man* or *scientist*.¹³

¹²See W. K. Hancock, *Professing History* (Sydney, 1976) and Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft*, trans. Peter Putnam (Manchester, 1976).

¹³For my fuller answer to the still repeated and absurd "received" opinions on J. R. Forster, the scientist, see Michael E. Hoare, *The Tactless Philosopher: Johann Reinhold Forster (1729–1798)* (Melbourne, 1976).

Were we, some noted at this juncture, now dividing between a pre-Beaglehole or Beaglehole generation of Cook scholars on one hand and a post-Beaglehole group of revisionists and some heretics on the other?

The second session, "Cook's Influence on Subsequent Explorations of the North Pacific," took us away from the divided Cook scholars of the southern hemisphere and into the historical controversies, mostly contemporary, surrounding Cook's exploring activities in the north. The papers in this session ranged from the tendentious to the geopolitical. In Dr. James Gibson's account of "The Significance of Cook's Third Voyage to Russian Tenure in the North Pacific," we were presented with evidence of a Russian presence on the American coast much earlier than had been commonly accepted before, i.e. at Illiuluk in 1772 or 1773. But some were left, too, with the impression that Gibson was unwilling or unable to impute any positive quality to the Russian Pacific explorers or their contemporary and later *confrères*. That there was some ambivalence in Russian historiography towards Cook's voyages was amply shown by Dr. Terence Armstrong of the Scott Polar Research Institute (Cambridge, England) in his "Cook's Reputation in Russia" wherein he presented a graph of Russian reactions towards Cook down through two hundred years. The factors governing the Russians' blowing hot or cold—so to speak—*vis-à-vis* Cook were imperialistic ones. After the Second World War, Antarctica loomed larger in strategic thinking and it would not have done to allow Cook too much priority of discovery in the deep south, despite the adequately attested exploration of the second voyage.

Dr. Armstrong did a great service for the English language world of Cook scholarship in highlighting for a wider audience the immense labors of the Soviet Cook scholar Yakov M. Svet. Svet has done most towards restoring a balance in modern Russian writing on Cook, especially in his Russian translations and further editing of Beaglehole's Cook journals done for the Hakluyt Society.¹⁴ By one of those accidents (or contrivances) which many have come to expect at international gatherings of this sort, Russian scholarship was denied its platform by the non-arrival of the designated paper-readers. Fortunately, however, the paper by Svet and Sevelana G. Fedorova "The Third Voyage of Captain James Cook in Russia" has been issued in volume three of the

¹⁴Terence Armstrong, "Cook's Reputation in Russia," SFU Papers, I, 15 pp., p. 9.

unedited typescript papers sent out by SFU after the Conference.¹⁵ It was originally received too late to table for the Conference in Vancouver.

The researches of Russian scholars and of others like G. R. V. Barratt and Armstrong are now showing that Pacific historians and anthropologists still have to contend with and absorb a vast amount of unpublished materials in Soviet archives and repositories related to Russian voyages of explorations in the Pacific, for which Cook's expeditions were undoubtedly the catalyst.¹⁶

Dr. Christon Archer, having given a forewarning of his interests in the first session's discussion, severed temporarily the Russian connection to stake a claim for "The Spanish Reaction to Cook's Third Voyage." Archer reiterated again the old style cloak-and-dagger secret diplomacy and exploring of a Spain responding to English and Russian intrusion on the northwest coast. Drawing upon an impressive research experience and immersion in Spanish and South American archives, Archer highlighted the Spaniards' strengths as explorers: their ethnological abilities and "realistic view of Indian societies" based upon long experience. The Spanish weaknesses lay in a sort of innate intestinal inability to exploit the discoveries to commercial advantage. The Spanish—and this is not often the conventional wisdom—became more adroit as scientific explorers in their reaction to Cook than is sometimes allowed. Archer noted: "Cook gave them a growing awareness of the full importance of applying the enlightenment and of publicizing the national scientific exploits."¹⁷ After 1795, however, Spain withdrew from the Pacific north and further important scientific and ethnological sources remained hidden from view until more recent generations of scholarship. But Dr. Archer met his own reaction in discussion! Heat, at times, one must suggest, almost threatened to obscure measured scholarship.

The third session of the "Impact Upon the European Mind" of Cook's voyaging paraded the old master—if one can respectfully use

¹⁵Thirty-two pages. The appendix of this paper (pp. 28–32) comprises the important "Inventory of Objectives Delivery by Lieutenant-Colonel Behm from Kamchatka, 1780," now in the archives of the USSR Academy of Science, Leningrad. This material, hitherto largely unknown in the ethnographical literature of Cook and the Pacific, was given by Captain Clerke to Behm when the expedition called at Petropavlovsk, Kamchatka, in April–June 1799.

¹⁶See D. D. Tumarkin, "Twenty-five years after Captain Cook: the First Russian Round-the-World Expedition in Hawaii," SFU Papers, III, 40 pp. This paper relates the voyage of I. F. Krusenstern, which left Kronstadt in 1803.

¹⁷Christon Archer, "The Spanish Reaction to Cook's Third Voyage," SFU Papers, I, 38 pp., p. 3.

that term for one so seminal in the field as Professor Bernard Smith—and two younger scholars who are making their mark in Cook studies so far as the literary and iconographic legacies are concerned, *viz.* Dr. Alan Frost of Melbourne and Dr. Rüdiger Joppien of Cologne. A more senior New Zealand scholar, but still withal a relatively recent arrival in Cook historiography with his monumental study of *Omai: Pacific Envoy* (Auckland, 1977), was Dr. Eric McCormick of Auckland University. McCormick's exhaustive work on Omai has really left little else, it seems, to say upon the subject. The thesis of his paper, however, that "the return of Omai to the Pacific" was the primary aim of Cook's third voyage came under considerable criticism in subsequent discussion.

Professor Smith treated the Conference to some new, memorable and thought-provoking perspectives on "Cook's Posthumous Reputations." Cook, in his death, suggested Smith, was "the proto-typical hero of European imperialism."¹⁸ Smith then gave us an exposé of the Cook eulogies in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, emphasizing at the same time the "new kind of hero" Cook was for his times as the master of contemporary science and of the practicalities of navigation, health and hygiene. He was a new professional in an age of technical expansion and achievement. Although Smith made no specific reference to George Forster's essay of 1787, one had the impression of having already passed this way, of having seen this Cook through the contemporary eyes of Forster before.

We passed quickly through Cook the missionary martyr; Cook the antipodean colonial nationalists' hero to Cook the schoolboy's model. Cook could even become an imperial commercial model, the darling possibly of free-trade and imperial progress. Certainly, for distant lands not intent at foundation on finding traditions in the lore of their own indigenous peoples, for lands like Australia and New Zealand, Cook could become a founding father. There were, it is true, too, a few what we today would perhaps call fatal impacters from the beginning to tarnish the hero's crown. Was there not, suggested Smith, "a pre-historic and sub-literate resentment among the indigenous people of the Pacific that rarely surfaced during the nineteenth century?" And there were, too, those anti-Cook, yet influential, European missionaries in the Pacific.

Smith was not out to discredit the achievements of Cook but he was intent rather on seeing them placed in a new perspective. Here, in Smith's paper, we moved swiftly to another major theme of the Confer-

¹⁸Bernard Smith, "Cook's Posthumous Reputation," SFU Papers, I, 38 pp., p. 3.

ence: Cook and his work should be interpreted in a less Europocentric fashion than they have been in the past.¹⁹ Here was, indeed, another hint of heresy: Cook discovered little that was new in lands; indigenous peoples had preceded him by centuries; pre-historians are perhaps *the* legitimate scholars, said Smith, to interpret discovery. Cook's "ships began the process of making the world a global village."

Smith's was one of the really important papers of the Cook Conference. The man who had influenced so many Cook and Pacific researchers in the 1960s and 1970s with his *European vision and the South Pacific* (London, 1960) was, almost twenty years later, asking us to view the Pacific and Cook through non-European eyes to find a new perspective. The old master had gathered no dust: new oils had been applied. One wondered, indeed, if in ideas—as opposed to faithful and insightful reflection, reproduction, rumination and rendition—J. C. Beaglehole had ever been so seminal or provoking in the field of Cook studies.

Rüdiger Joppien—surely a Bernard Smith heir or protégé—delivered another reminder, as others would do, in his paper on "The Artistic Bequest of Captain Cook's Voyages" that the iconography of Cook's expeditions, even long decades after their completion, still provided rich lodes to mine. For about seventy years, noted Joppien, "illustrations from Cook's voyages were repeatedly used as illustrative evidence . . . an impressive record for the esteem of Cook as a naval man and explorer."²⁰ The iconography was for that long regarded as vitally and instructively sacrosanct. Alan Frost, with a native *élan* and building massively upon his earlier scholarship in the field, ranged deep and wide in the literature of the British Romantics to demonstrate the role and impact of the "new geographical perspectives" of "a second great age of modern European exploration" which began, Frost suggested, with Commodore John Byron in 1764.²¹ Although Frost took nine—and in my opinion unnecessarily (for such an audience)—detailed pages on the history of eighteenth-century science and exploration to reach his central thesis, the prolonged overture was soon forgotten in the depth of the movements. It was a memorable paper on the interplay of exploration, *belles lettres* and ideas in the eighteenth century and later.

¹⁹Smith, p. 33.

²⁰Rüdiger Joppien, "The Artistic Bequest of Captain Cook's Voyages, SFU Papers, I, 37 pp., p. 29.

²¹Alan Frost, "New Geographical Perspectives and the Emergence of the Romantic Imagination," SFU Papers, I, 45 pp. See also Alan Frost, "Captain James Cook and the Early Romantic Imagination," *Captain James Cook Image and Impact: South Sea Discoverers and the World of Letters*, ed. Walter Veit (Melbourne, 1972), pp. 90–106.

Towards its middle, the SFU Cook Conference moved into two sessions on the more scientific aspects of the voyages. The first of these (session four) embraced the well-tilled theme "Cook and Navigation." But this was not simply a further eulogy on Cook's legendary achievements in this "branch of his business" or upon the superiority of the British Navy over all others. Dr. James Pritchard of Queen's University, Ontario, presented a very important paper on the history of French Canadian science before British annexation in his "The Precursors of James Cook on the Saint Lawrence River." With this he effectively demolished the long-standing English myth that scientific surveying in eastern Canada began with the arrival of the British naval hydrographers in 1759. To historians of eighteenth-century science (or earlier) it would seem inconceivable that the French, with their mastery of fine instrumentation and mathematics, should have been behind or lax in scientifically mapping and surveying their overseas possessions and, more especially, of a waterway so arterial and vital as the St. Lawrence. Dr. Pritchard did a great service in boldly bringing the men and techniques which were the products of a superior French science to the fore.

Admiral G. S. Ritchie in his "Captain Cook's Influence on Hydrographic Surveying" preceded from this same premise of French hydrographic preeminence in the late seventeenth century into a very closely argued summary of the background leading to Cook's revolutionizing of British hydrography. Good health, a belief in the use of the latest and best instruments and, most interestingly indeed, Cook's "feeling for science" were seen by Ritchie as three of several factors in Cook's success. His association with his other scientists, however tedious those scientists may have seemed, "broadened his mental horizons far beyond those of a practical seaman."

Here, I suggest, from Admiral Ritchie, is an insight—by others it might be regarded as a "concession"—which future Cook biographers or interpreters may examine more closely with profit. J. A. Forster had espoused the same theme in the 1780s.²²

The subsequent session was expressly devoted to "Scientific Aspects of Cook's Voyages" by which was understood the sciences of botany, zoology and medicine. Here three of the four lecturers were already acknowledged scholars of Cook and the fourth, Surgeon Vice-Admiral Sir James Watt modestly introduced himself as a novice in the field. But his noviciate proved short-lived for he presented a closely argued paper

²²Hoare, *Tactless Philosopher*, p. 237.

on "Medical Aspects and Consequences of Captain Cook's Voyages" which became another highlight of this revisionary Conference.

Watt addressed himself first to the age-old idea that Cook's greatest contribution—among many—to naval hygiene was the reduction of scurvy at sea. His critical re-examination of the evidence was made more pointed by the fact that he concentrated initially on the second voyage as the hitherto acknowledged basis for Cook's reputation for preserving life at sea. This voyage was fraught with more illness and disease than the taciturn Cook revealed in his journals. "We have," argued Watt penetratingly,

no idea how many men were ill in the *Resolution* either from scurvy or any other illness. There is ample documentary evidence of at least four outbreaks of scurvy in *Resolution* during this epoch making voyage which for two centuries, has been identified with the conquest of scurvy by Cook.²³

And there was more. As I have suspected from editing J. R. Forster's second voyage journal the psycho-medical aspects of this gruelling navigation should claim more attention.²⁴ Then there is the subsequently crucial subject of Cook's nearly fatal illness of early 1774, which the navigator at first tried to hide and treat by starvation. Departing completely from previous medical commentary, Watt suggested that Cook's intestinal obstruction and other acute symptoms was caused by "a heavy round-worm infestation of the intestine," a result of eating native foods. From this second voyage investigation the two medical men in the *Resolution*, James Patten and William Anderson, emerged in a most favorable light. Those in the *Adventure*, however, under the laxer Tobias Furneaux were slated roundly.

With similar innovative medical penetration, Watt carried us through the other two voyages. Of the first, in the *Endeavour*, he concluded that Cook's surgeons did not produce "an impressive health record." Even in the matter of the malarial and dysentery epidemic at Batavia—which decimated Cook's crew and which Watt, arguing from contemporary and historical evidence, attributed to the contamination of local drinking water by a species of sea-slug—Cook was, perhaps, not entirely blameless: "his preoccupation with the ship at Batavia rather than with men is evident from his journal." Even his predecessor, Wal-

²³James Watt, "Medical Aspects and Consequences of Captain Cook's Voyages," SFU Papers, II, 34 pp., p. 8.

²⁴See my Introduction to *The Resolution Journal of Johann Reinhold Forster, 1772-1775* (Cambridge, at press), 4 vols.

lis, had been stricter in enforcing the precepts of James Lind for visits to tropical ports.

In a further historically scrupulous examination of the competing merits of malt wort and lemon juice on the arresting of scurvy, Watt emphasized the adverse effect of patronage on medical ideas and practice in the Royal Navy. Cook (and other influentials) espoused malt wort and the brilliant clinical demonstrations of the efficacy of lemon juice made by Lind were officially considered useless until 1796. But Cook's scurvy work was not all negative, since he did contribute to its arrest by his insistence on short sea passages between refreshment landfalls and, although unconsciously, by reducing the rate of his men's utilization of vitamin C by providing warm, dry clothing and the implementation of the less stressful three-watch system.²⁵

Lind emerged, again justifiably, as Watt's naval medical hero in his criticism of Cook's failure to exploit water distillation to the full. On the third voyage there were no major innovations, no experiments, but the medical history or climaxes were, Watt argued, the keys to that navigator's history. Venereal disease was the central problem. The red-blooded young blades of the third voyage, over whom Cook now exercised little real control, gave and received the diseases (syphilis and gonorrhoea) almost with abandon. All of Cook's efforts to enforce abstinence or moderation were frustrated: Cook was defeated.

He was, indeed, in Watt's prognosis defeated not only by stress—Beaglehole's and others' assessment and reason for the navigator's passions, ravings and trances—but also by his physical failure in health. If Cook had contracted a parasitic infection of the intestine on the second voyage he could, Watt was tempted to suggest, have had a concomitant thiamine (vitamin B12) deficiency which would account for his loss of his normally rigid mental controls. Had he, Cook, recognized, too, the early symptoms of the tuberculosis which carried away some significant men on this last voyage?

The medical and psycho-medical bases for reinterpreting or reinforcing naval history and other historical writing are becoming increasingly important as a field of study. There is no doubt that Admiral Watt has given this work a significant new impetus for Cook studies and for the wider field of Pacific voyages and settlement.²⁶

²⁵Watt, p. 22.

²⁶For a recent antipodean reinterpretation of history along these lines see Bryan Candevia, "Socio-medical Factors in the Evolution of the First Settlement at Sydney Cove, 1788–1803," *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, 61 (March, 1975), 1–25.

The natural historical session was somewhat overshadowed by Watt's new perspectives. But Phyllis Edwards in her essay on "Banks and the Botany of Cook's Three Voyages" and Dr. Peter Whitehead with his up-dated summary of people and institutions involved in the complex zoological dispersal of Cook-based specimens, brought forward much new evidence to supplement our knowledge of this now quickly expanding branch of Cook studies. For too long in the history of the natural history there has been a naïve uncritical trotting out of old prides and prejudices concerning the work of Cook's scientists. The modern growth of history and philosophy of science as a major new discipline has now spread over into the Cook and Pacific studies arena and there is a greatly improved and critical writing ahead in the field.

Evidence of this was given in the tabled paper of David G. Medway entitled "Some Ornithological Results of Cook's Third Voyage."²⁷ Medway is introducing to Cook ornithological studies something of that same tenacious determination to track down provenance and specimens which has characterized the writings of Whitehead in zoology and Adrienne Kaeppler in ethnography. Medway, in a paper which will attract a wide audience, is giving here an earnest of his grander design to present monographs and, perhaps, a complete study in the future of the ornithology of Cook's Pacific voyages. His will be a career to be watched closely in the Cook studies field.²⁸

The penultimate session of the seven convened at SFU dealt with "Cook and Indigenous People." The three papers presented occasioned some lively and penetrating discussion.

Peter Gathercole in a critical reappraisal of the historiography of Polynesian ethnography from the time of Cook, with particular reference to New Zealand—the sphere of some of Gathercole's own field researches from the 1950s—neatly turned his essay to conform with a schema of the "New Zealand scholar" as outlined in 1954 by J. C. Beaglehole: the perspective of the man of two cultures, European and Polynesian.²⁹ Gathercole reminded us that Polynesian historiography had taken great strides forward in recent years with anthropologists' attempts to discern and understand indigenous "Polynesian societies in their own terms" and the bringing by archaeologists of a more precise concept of time to Polynesian studies, wherein Cook's arrival and ac-

²⁷SFU Papers, II, 49 pp.

²⁸See also David G. Medway, "Extant Types of New Zealand Birds from Cook's Voyages," *Notornis*, 23, Nos. 1 and 2 (1976), 44–60 and 120–137. Medway has fully identified and annotated hundreds of bird references in my edition of J. R. Forster's *Journal*.

²⁹John C. Beaglehole, *The New Zealand Scholar* (Christchurch, 1954), 24 pp.

counts represented a "major chronological marker." Polynesia has and now reveals a prehistory. With Cook many widely scattered Pacific indigenous societies pass from prehistory into history.³⁰

Gathercole showed that of all Polynesian societies the richest sources of historical ethnography relate to the New Zealand Maoris. Post European-settlement Maori ethnology was scarcely pristine: Europeans and Maoris themselves wrote within a society and culture affected, if not dominated, by "history in European terms." Gathercole showed perceptively that the clashes between Europeans and Maoris in the nineteenth century (and one might also add today) were not only over land but also over *ideas*. In short Gathercole was saying that Cook's accounts are more significant for attempting to study traditional Maori society than those of the nineteenth century.

Gathercole, seeing with ethnographers "as much significance in localised everyday behaviour as in that which is unusual," spent over half of his paper relating the written and visual observations of Cook, the Forsters, Wales, and the artist Hodges during their visit in the *Resolution* to Dusky Sound, New Zealand, in March and April 1773, to modern knowledge about Maori ceremonial, ritual and customs. There were some remarkable correlations between observed contemporary evidence and the *assumed* Maori cultural responses consistent with those observations. But, Gathercole reminded us, there are still serious limitations in contemporary European recorded evidence.

The evidence is, indeed, ambiguous; the result of a "two opposites . . . dialectical interaction," i.e. the Maoris' assumption of European values by their very tacit acceptance of the visiting Europeans ceremonially and courteously into the Maori world of values. This question—which much recent research is throwing up again and again—is very much related to the fundamental one of the points and times in change of Maori culture. Old assumptions that change was prehistoric are now challenged by the growing and more common thesis that European ideas and technology influenced Maori culture for change in the protohistoric period.³¹

³⁰Peter Gathercole, "Perceptions of Order: the Significance of Cook's Voyages for the Study of Polynesian Ethnography, with Particular Reference to New Zealand," SFU Papers, II, 27 pp., p. 5.

³¹Gathercole cites the unpublished dissertation (M.A. Auckland University, 1964) by L. A. Groube, "Settlement Patterns in Prehistoric New Zealand," as evidence for change in the protohistoric period. A recent B.A. dissertation by one of my own students, James Belich (Victoria University of Wellington, 1977), "Some Critical Observations on the Modern Military Interpretation of the Maori Wars," graphically treats the same theme.

Dr. Adrienne Kaeppler's paper on "The Significance of Cook's Third Voyage for Hawaiian Art and Society" built very much upon her earlier research essays in the fields of Cook or prehistoric ethnography and ethnology. Not surprisingly her arguments paralleled for Hawaiian society very much those of Gathercole's for New Zealand. "Classic" Hawaiian forms in the material culture of the island group "evolved from specific traditional forms in the post-contact period." Taking feathered cloaks and capes as one functional and symbolic feature of material cultural evolution, Kaeppler showed first of all how, according to her hypothesizing, their form and shape had changed since pre-contact times, when they were worn "as visual symbols of status, rank and power"—including protection in warfare—to become in style "the most appropriate for ceremonial purposes." Kaeppler's study then ranged over other forms of apparel, adornment and images known to have been collected on Cook's third voyage. Inevitably, therefore, as Gathercole had demanded drastic revision of a number of prominent nineteenth century and later workers on "classic" Maori culture, writers such as Elsdon Best and Stephensen Percy Smith, so Kaeppler called into question some of the writings of such authorities as Peter H. Buck (Te Rangi Hiroa) and William T. Brigham on Hawaii. Kaeppler's work purported to show the immense changes down through time wrought by the introduction of metal tools on Hawaiian material culture. European weapons "changed the balance of power and chiefs gained prestige by warfare rather than by genealogy. . . . In short," she concluded, "changes in material culture were material manifestations of changes in society."³²

Here we might pause to suggest that, not unexpectedly, Cook studies may dwell heavily upon Hawaiian themes for the next few years. The fatal 14 February 1779 duly (and, Admiral Watt argued, almost inexorably—if medicine and psychology are to be believed—quite apart from complex anthropological questions) plucked our "hero" from the stage, although most of the *dramatis personae* sailed on for nearly another two years. There will be, indeed there are warnings enough already, of more books and writings on the death of Cook. Clearly many are convinced that Beaglehole, even at the height of his literary powers in the *Life of Cook*,³³ has not said the last word on what one speaker from the floor of the SFU Conference called "the greatest thing that happened to Cook," i.e. his death at Kealakekua Bay.

³²Adrienne Kaeppler, "The Significance of Cook's Third Voyage for the Study of Hawaiian Art and Society," SFU Papers, II, 23 pp., p. 22.

³³See especially the chapter "Kealakekua Bay," Beaglehole, *Life*, pp. 636-672.

At the time of this writing we already have promise from the University of Strathclyde of Gavin Kennedy's new book *The Death of Captain Cook*³⁴ which claims that the circumstances of Cook's death have never been satisfactorily explained. Kennedy's work also purports to be based on a study of all the contemporary evidence of the men on the third voyage and on field work carried out in Hawaii. Captain King's version of the incidents are, we will be shown, deficient in many respects.³⁵

To add to this "death harvest," so to speak, there is the as yet unpublished—but now at press—essay by Professor Gordon Parsonson of the University of Otago, Dunedin, entitled *On the Death of Captain Cook*.³⁶ Parsonson, in brief (and here we can scarcely do his stimulating essay justice) demands that we attempt to understand Cook's death, "perhaps one of the most famous events in Pacific history" as an incident arising out of the complex divisions and religious practices and beliefs in Hawaii. Cook became dedicated to the inferior god, Lono, whose followers were tributary to an upper class, "a true military aristocracy" worshipping the war god Kukulaimoku. Cook's death, therefore, argues Parsonson, was somewhat unrehearsed or a sacrifice after he laid sacrilegious hands on Kalani'opu'u, a chief of the higher order. In Hawaiian terms Cook was, therefore, no god but "a lesser being, the representative of a lesser god, a popular god."

Parsonson in his essay takes issue with Beaglehole over many interpretations of Polynesian culture and history. In the case of Hawaii he accepts as axiomatic—unlike Beaglehole, Buck, Dahlgren, Stokes and others, but raising some evocative support by implication for Robert Langdon's theses of *The Lost Caravel* (Sydney, 1975)—that the "evi-

³⁴To be published by Duckworths, London, in the Fall of 1978. Dr. Kennedy is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Economics, University of Strathclyde.

³⁵I am grateful for this pre-publication information to the SFU Cook Conference of 1978 which received it from Dr. Kennedy in April 1978. Kennedy is suggesting some provocative findings in his other Cook studies works now at press. Of his *Bligh* it is predicted that the book will be the first biography of Captain Bligh to examine all the sources, offering a new interpretation of the mutiny on the *Bounty* and its aftermath. Kennedy has also edited R. T. Gould's *Captain Cook* (London, 1935) as evidence of the best short summary still available on Cook: "hardly any corrections were needed even in the light of forty years' scholarship" [sic]. These are large claims on the dustjacket of *The Death of Captain Cook* (1978).

³⁶Originally a lecture delivered to the Historical Section of the Otago Branch of the Royal Society of New Zealand, Dunedin, 19 July 1976. An expanded version (24 pages) is deposited in the Hocken Library, Dunedin. I gratefully acknowledge Professor Parsonson's generosity in letting me quote from it.

dence in favor of an earlier Spanish contact ... in Hawaii ... seems overwhelming."³⁷ In so doing he, like Kaeppler, makes a strong appeal for evidence to Hawaiian material culture. But their premises and conclusions, of course, are, shall we say, contacts apart! In Parsonson's absence to defend himself in Vancouver, Kaeppler did, however, openly disagree with him in discussion.

Kaeppler's recent major contribution to Cook studies is undoubtedly her organization of the major exhibition of Cook cultural artifacts collected on the three voyages and brought together again from January to August 1978 in a magnificent, imaginative exhibition at the Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu. The pieces are from all over the world. The associated catalogue *Artificial Curiosities* ... (Honolulu, 1978) is in itself a major contribution to the illustrative Cook literature.³⁸

Dr. Robin Fisher, a new scholar in the field but nevertheless a prime mover of the Vancouver Conference, gave promise of some new directions in culture contact research in the Cook field in his paper "Cook and the Nootka."³⁹ Fisher set out, too, to revise and review some of the received opinion on "dominance" of the significant longer land-fall situations in the Pacific by Europeans in Cook's and in contemporary and later vessels of exploration. Fisher showed a deep acquaintance with the Nootka Sound sources and with the previous Canadian and other literature on the subject. Fisher's principal thesis was that, both during Cook's visit and for many years subsequently, the Indians controlled the fur trade and not their sea-borne guests. On Vancouver Island, as in New Zealand, Hawaii and, presumably, also elsewhere, the indigenous peoples "were on the threshold of an immutable process of cultural change, began and sustained by European contact."⁴⁰

Dr. Fisher promises to give us further culture contact studies of Cook's significant landfalls: it is a research task in reciprocity between cultures which may well spell a major new trend in Cook studies.

We left the session and concomitant animated discussions on indigenous cultures and exploration with the distinct view that there was a welcome vitality in culture contact and pre-contact scholarship. As Professor Megaw of Leicester (formerly Australia) said, "native peoples had now also discovered Cook." Contributions from the floor were as

³⁷Parsonson, "On the Death of Captain Cook," pp. 10-24.

³⁸In association with the "Artificial Curiosities" exhibition and the SFU Conference, a series of lectures was delivered by overseas scholars on aspects of Cook studies at the Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

³⁹SFU Papers, II, 29 pp.

⁴⁰Fisher, "Cook and the Nootka," p. 24.

before most stimulating. The highest form of art for the Polynesian, reminded one Hawaiian delegate, was the canoe *not* the artifact. Another student of Asian culture recalled that some scholars remained confident of a Chinese exploration and presence on the northwest coast aeons before Cook. One commentator asked *the* apposite question, "In Cook studies aren't we all antiquarians?"

The final session in Vancouver was devoted to "Cook's Contemporaries" or rather the work and influence of some of them. There is still one great gap in late eighteenth-century (and Cook) historiography and biography: the life and work of Sir Joseph Banks. This last session forecast at least two important books on this important subject.

One *leitmotif* of Harold B. Carter's paper "Cook's Oxford Tutor: Sir Joseph Banks and European Expansion in the Pacific Region, 1767-1820" was one to which we had grown accustomed: revision of Beaglehole's writings and perceptions. Carter has for some years been gathering the immense, widely scattered but influential epistolary and manuscript relics of Banks ("*H. M. Ministre des Affaires Philosophiques*," as William Eden called him so appositely)⁴¹ at the British Museum (Natural History) in London. For many years one has been aware, both through personal contact and by reading some of his preliminary writings on Banks, that Carter has harbored very different views about his subject to those expressed by Beaglehole. Here the pent-up scholarly resentments found fuller expression. "After a century and a half of desultory essays at a biography" of Banks enough materials—one suspects, indeed, a superfluity for any one scholar in a lifetime—are known to "exorcise the pejorative appreciations of the literary historian which have established the warped image of Banks as the amateur and dilettante."⁴² This is a reference to Beaglehole's essay "The Young Banks" published in the first volume of his two-volume edition of *The Endeavour Journal of Joseph Banks, 1768-1771* (Sydney, 1962, second edition, 1963), which some, however, have seen as one of Beaglehole's best literary essays.⁴³

Carter was at great pains to establish Banks's place as "the young professional just fledged" in science at twenty-five years of age when he first rubbed up against "Cook the professional at forty" in the *En-*

⁴¹Harold B. Carter, "Cook's Oxford Tutor: Sir Joseph Banks and European Expansion in the Pacific Region," SFU Papers, II, 27 pp., p. 19.

⁴²Carter, p. 1.

⁴³This view was expressed to me by, among others, one of Beaglehole's former Wellington colleagues, the Pacific historian Mrs. Mary Boyd.

deavour. Carter here brought us back to the thesis raised by Admiral Ritchie earlier (and J. R. Forster in the 1780s): "Banks was no elegant, useless or irritating burden carelessly flung on the shoulders of a long-suffering naval commander."⁴⁴

One profound appendix to Carter's paper on Banks was that tabled—but unfortunately not read in the full time allotted to other speakers—by Dr. David Mackay of Victorian University of Wellington, Beaglehole's *Alma Mater*. Mackay, building upon his doctoral work at London University (1970) and more recent research, saw Banks, in Beaglehole's words, as "A presiding genius of exploration." He became "the virtual guardian of the Cook tradition . . . the custodian of the model" so expertly established by Cook in the business of exploration. The *Endeavour* experience "established Banks as the general director of exploration in the late eighteenth century."⁴⁵ He was, too, the British government's principal adviser on matters of science and, very often, colonial policy. One of the great merits of Mackay's research has been to expand immensely our understanding and knowledge of Banks's seminal role in the general organization of scientific voyages of exploration after Cook. He presided, indeed, over a whole fifty years of British imperial and scientific expansion. Mackay is steeped in the official and quasi-official correspondence and memoranda of the period. While Carter may unravel the Banksian biography it is to Mackay that we will look to elucidate "the intellectual and administrative context in which the voyages of Cook and his followers went forward" and wherein Banks gained "the opportunity to achieve his extraordinary authority."

His career tells us much about the nature and role of science in the eighteenth century; the particular legacy of Cook's voyages; the expansion of governmental functions; and the problems of imperial administration following the American War of Independence.⁴⁶

It would be churlish here to take issue with either Mackay's scientific history or with Carter's placing of Banks into the innovative scientific research of the eighteenth or early nineteenth century. Certainly, I agree, we must see Banks as a mediating, catalytic figure and, most definitely, as the purveyor to empire and the Pacific of a Baconian and

⁴⁴Carter, p. 15.

⁴⁵David Mackay, "A Presiding Genius of Exploration: Banks, Cook and Empire, 1767-1805," SFU Papers, III, 25 pp., p. 17.

⁴⁶Mackay, p. 2.

utilitarian view of science. His role in acclimatization was seminal and vital in some cases to the successful establishment of European outposts of empire on the Pacific rim and in the islands.

Mackay, Fisher, Archer, Gibson and others gave sufficient proof in their reported research that Cook studies can lay claim to some important perceptions and reinterpretations in the writing of European imperial history. The Conference was, in this and other respects, a great boost to eighteenth-century studies.

Dr. Howard Fry of the James Cook University of North Queensland at Townsville was no unexpected disputant in the lists of controversy over the influence of Cook's contemporaries. Fry's principal work *Alexander Dalrymple and the Expansion of British Trade* (London and Toronto, 1970) came, it seems, too late to influence Beaglehole's sometimes damning and, we now know, largely unwarranted strictures on the Scottish hydrographer, geographer and polemicist, Dalrymple. In my view Fry's critical reassessment of Dalrymple and Beaglehole on Dalrymple should now gain wide recognition in Cook studies. As I have pointed out in several places, Beaglehole did in fact tone down some of his more sweeping and unfounded earlier epithets and strictures on the Scot in the course of his writing and editing of Cook,⁴⁷ but the New Zealander could never satisfactorily see Dalrymple as anything more than a theoretical and outspoken rival to his hero, Cook.

More than most at the SFU Conference, Fry was bold and brave in his outspoken criticism of Beaglehole's scholarship. His paper on "the creative interplay" between the careers of Cook and Dalrymple cleared up many of the received misconceptions on Dalrymple as a geographical theorist and sort of self-appointed devil's advocate of South Seas' exploration. Dalrymple is Fry's eighteenth-century Richard Hakluyt. Beaglehole was accused directly of the "cavalier treatment of evidence and the brushing aside of contradictory testimony."⁴⁸ At times one was conscious that Dalrymple might be creatively linked with Beaglehole since it was the latter, argued Fry, who, as the eighteenth-century Scotsman's "leading twentieth-century detractor," employed too much so-called "cautious and non-committal scepticism" in failing to read and research Dalrymple's real role and influence upon British exploration at the time of and following Cook.

⁴⁷See Hoare, *In the Steps of Beaglehole*, pp. 13-14 and "Two Centuries' Perceptions of James Cook," pp. 7-8.

⁴⁸Howard T. Fry, "Alexander Dalrymple and Captain Cook: the Creative Interplay of Two Careers," SFU Papers, III, 32 pp., p. 1.

Fry showed convincingly that historical antipathy to Dalrymple over Cook has been based upon the "false theory" of an obscure Frenchman, Frédéric Metz, in 1805 who dreamt up an "emnity" between Dalrymple and Cook. It was a myth as fatal and pervasive down through time as any the French or others had concocted over false straits or islands. It is to be hoped that Fry's direct, uncompromising and honest plea for a reassessment of Dalrymple's role in the opening of the Pacific Ocean will be heeded by future writers on Cook and his times. Fry, needless to say, was roundly challenged in discussion.

That ubiquitous scholar Dr. Helen Wallis of the British Library terminated the Vancouver Cook feast with her "Postscript to the Voyages: Some New Sources and Assessment." Dr. Wallis, with all the authority of a Hakluyt Society editor of Carteret's voyage, led us in effect through the complicated, sometimes murky territory, of Cook's contemporary editors. Some ground, let it be admitted, was already well known but not the complicated relations between Canon Douglas, Captain King and others in connection with the publication of the official account of the third voyage of 1784.

Whither then Cook studies? Firstly, unlike all previous Cook anniversaries, this one, the highpoint of over ten years of intensive bicentennial research, will scarcely, like so many before, fade away in plaudits and encomiums. It will not wither. This one junket, if such it was, may become a juggernaut in some areas of Pacific studies. The ideas, new researches, new materials, new interpretations and critical scholarship must affect the whole spectrum of European and indigenous research and writing on the Pacific basin; historically, anthropologically, scientifically, biographically and editorially. We still await Smith and Joppien's Catalogue of the artistic legacy and, now, from Australia, comes the announcement of a series of works on the botanical artists of Cook's voyages. The science of Cook's voyages is still relatively neglected but much good work is in prospect. We await, too, soon the unpublished Journals of J. R. Forster and King, and where is William Anderson's vital missing Journal? The bicentenary year of Cook's death is now upon us with the promise of major exhibitions in London and Wellington. In Middlesbrough some exciting research—if it can remain rigorously scholarly—is likely to throw new light on Cook's connections and influences of youth. More myths may dissipate.

SFU Vancouver was, as we have said, a revisionary Conference in intent and results. Cook was, in effect, "demythologized." But do we see a smaller Cook, a more human Cook? We certainly see latterly a suffering, physically weak Cook. We see Cook as a whole man. We see

a Cook set into the matrix of his increasingly complex yet expansive age. With Bernard Smith we see Cook discovering "a golden age" but substituting for it just as quickly—as science and enlightenment dictated—an "iron age." We see Cook's contemporaries emerging, too, as men of stature in science, government and letters. They helped Cook grow and grew with him. We sense a timely revitalizing of Polynesian, Melanesian and other Pacific and Pacific coast indigenous studies and, most welcome, a less Eurocentric view of pre-contact and post-contact societies. Art, iconography, artifacts, canoes and specimens: materials of men and biota of nature command more exact and meticulous study. Cook is no longer a proto-hero: others most certainly went before: perhaps Chinese, Portuguese, Spanish and, certainly, Polynesians. We see Cook studies, too, as part of a now meticulously-documented Russian, Spanish, French and British expansion at different phases, as part of the gaining of successful European toeholds of empire in the Pacific.

Cook studies embrace academics and laymen alike, since its exponents are "antiquarians in the highest sense and historians in the antiquarian sense." Those who are historians or use historical methodology in their work can no longer approach along tunnels since scientists, medical men and others have mastered, too, the historical method. It has not always been so. We have been led to ask interdisciplinary questions about what "truth" it is that the artist, the scientist, the anthropologist and the historian are after.

If many of our cherished childhood and received ideas on Cook have taken a battering it has been in a good cause. Truth and scholarship are not advanced by sycophancy, by perpetuation of myth or arrogance of particular disciplines. Cook studies are an interdisciplinary and cross-cultural exercise.

Our debt of gratitude for giving corporate and individual new momentum to Cook and Pacific studies is great to all the scholars and devotees who assembled at Vancouver. But our debt is greater to Professor Phyllis Auty, the Conference Director, and her SFU colleagues for guiding with vision the bark into port. To J. C. Beaglehole, the absent voyager but the master who charted the shoals, our debt was the very possibility of SFU Vancouver. Now we must await expected further commentaries from incisive minds guiding scholarly Pacific pens like those of that silent watcher (and poet) of the Vancouver proceedings Professor Oskar Spate of Canberra.

Venus may have been observed and violated by Syphilus: gold became iron in fact and in the philosophy of men. But what we have

come away with is a European re-vision of the South *and* North Pacific. That alone is a memorable marker in Pacific studies.

Royal Society of New Zealand, Wellington.



